arXiv:1606.06119v1 [math.DS] 20 Jun 2016

ON THE EXISTENCE OF NON-HYPERBOLIC ERGODIC MEASURES AS THE LIMIT OF PERIODIC MEASURES

CHRISTIAN BONATTI AND JINHUA ZHANG

Abstract. [GIKN] and [BBD1] propose two very different ways for building non hyperbolic measures, [GIKN] building such a measure as the limit of periodic measures and [BBD1] as the ω-limit set of a single orbit, with a uniformly vanishing Lyapunov exponent. The technique in [GIKN] was essentially used in a generic setting, as the periodic orbits were built by small perturbations. It is not known if the measures obtained by the technique in [BBD1] are accumulated by periodic measures.

In this paper we use a shadowing lemma from [G]:

- for getting the periodic orbits in [GIKN] without perturbing the dynamics,
- for recovering the compact set in [BBD1] with a uniformly vanishing Lyapunov exponent by considering the limit of periodic orbits.

As a consequence, we prove that there exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{U}$ of the set of robustly transitive non-hyperbolic diffeomorphisms far from homoclinic tangencies, such that for any $f \in \mathcal{U}$, there exists a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure with full support and approximated by hyperbolic periodic measures.

We also prove that there exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{V}$ of the set of diffeomorphisms exhibiting a robust cycle, such that for any $f \in \mathcal{V}$, there exists a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure approximated by hyperbolic periodic measures.

1. Introduction

In 1960s, R. Abraham and S. Smale [AS] built an example breaking the dream of the density of hyperbolic systems among differentiable systems. Then people start to search for the robustly non-hyperbolic phenomena. M. Shub [Sh] and R. Mañé [M] built robustly transitive non-hyperbolic examples on $\mathbb{T}^4$ and $\mathbb{T}^3$ respectively. Using "blender", [BD1] built more general examples of robustly transitive non-hyperbolic diffeomorphisms on manifolds of dimension at least three.

In the celebrated paper [O], V.Oseledets proves that any ergodic measure is associated to some real numbers, called *Lyapunov exponents*, which describe the asymptotic behavior of the system on the tangent space over a full measure set. An ergodic measure is called *hyperbolic* if all of its Lyapunov exponents are non-zero. Pesin's theory shows that many properties of hyperbolic systems survive for generic point of a hyperbolic ergodic measure. Enlightened by this work, people start to study *non-uniformly hyperbolic systems*, that is, systems whose ergodic measures

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37D30, 37C40, 37C50, 37D25, 37A35.

Key words and phrases. blender, robust cycle, partial hyperbolicity, ergodic measure, Lyapunov exponent, non-hyperbolic measure, quasi hyperbolic string.

are all hyperbolic. There are non-uniformly hyperbolic systems which are not hyperbolic, (see for instance [CLR] which build a non-uniformly hyperbolic surface diffeomorphism exhibiting homoclinic tangency). However, it has been recently announced that such non-hyperbolic but non-uniformly hyperbolic systems cannot be C^1-robust (see [CCGWY]).

Comparing with hyperbolic situation, it was natural to ask whether the non-uniform hyperbolic systems are dense among the differentiable systems. The answer is "No": [KN] builds a C^1-open set of diffeomorphisms f having a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure. The example in [KN] uses a precise global setting (partially hyperbolic system obtained as small perturbations of skew product). Recently, [BBD1] shows that the C^1-robust existence of non-hyperbolic ergodic measure is open and dense among diffeomorphisms having a *robust cycle* (that is, hyperbolic sets of different indices whose stable manifolds of both of them intersect robustly the unstable manifold of the other).

The approaches of [KN] and [BBD1] are very different:

- [KN] builds the non-hyperbolic measure as being the weak$*$-limit of a sequence $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of *periodic measures* i.e. μ_n is the measure supported on a periodic orbit $\mathcal{O}_n$. The orbits $\mathcal{O}_n$ follow *a criterion from* [GIKN], explicitly stated in [BDG, Lemma 2.5], ensuring that the limit of the $\{\mu_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is ergodic.
- [BBD1] builds a partially hyperbolic compact invariant set of non-vanishing topological entropy so that every point has well defined and vanishing center Lyapunov exponent. This compact set is built as being the ω-limit set of a single point which satisfies a criterion called *controlled at any scale*.

It is not understood up to now if the measures built following the criterion in [GIKN] may have positive entropy, and in contrast it is not clear if the non-hyperbolic ergodic measures supported on the compact set built in [BBD1] are accumulated by periodic measures.

In this paper, we analyze the periodic orbits in a neighborhood of the robust cycle defined in [BBD1], and which are less and less hyperbolic: some of their Lyapunov exponents tends to 0. [DG, BDG] already considered such sequence of periodic orbits in a neighborhood of a robust cycle, but they build the periodic orbits by performing perturbations of the dynamics, so that their conclusion was in term of C^1-generic diffeomorphisms. Here we do not perturb the dynamics: under some open and dense geometric setting, we prove the existence of such periodic orbits by using the shadowing lemma in [G]. Let us present roughly our results:

- On one hand, combining the shadowing lemma by [G] and the [GIKN] criterion we build a sequence of hyperbolic periodic measures whose weak$*$-limit is a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure (Theorem C). As a consequence, Theorems 1.2 and A prove that, for an open and dense subset of robustly transitive partially hyperbolic but non-hyperbolic systems far from homoclinic tangencies, there exists a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure which has full support and is the weak$*$-limit of a sequence of hyperbolic periodic measures satisfying the [GIKN] criterion.

- On the other hand, in Theorem B, using the *controlled at any scale criterion* and the shadowing lemma by [G], we recover the compact invariant set K'_f in [BBD1], with well defined and vanishing center Lyapunov exponent, and we build a sequence of hyperbolic periodic orbits $\mathcal{O}_n$ whose center Lyapunov exponents tend to zero, and so that:
  - every weak$*$-limit measure μ of the measure μ_n supported on $\mathcal{O}_n$ is supported on K'_f;
  - the Hausdorff limit K_f of the sequence $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ contains K'_f.
  - any ergodic measure supported on K_f is either supported on K'_f or is a (unique) periodic measure.

We are now ready to present our precise setting and the statements of our results. We start with the consequences of our results in a global setting. Then we will present the more technical results in the local setting, which are the heart of our work.

1.1. **Results in the global setting.** Let $\mathcal{T}(M)$ be the subset of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{T}(M)$, we have that

- f is robustly transitive;
- f admits a partially hyperbolic splitting of the form
$$TM = E^s \oplus E^c_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E^c_k \oplus E^u$$
satisfying that $\dim(E^c_1) = \cdots = \dim(E^c_k) = 1$.
- there exist two hyperbolic periodic orbits of indices $\dim(E^s)$ and $\dim(E^s)+k$ respectively.

We denote by $\dim(E^s) = i_0$ and $\dim(M) = d$.

Remark 1.1.
- *By definition, $\mathcal{T}(M)$ is an open subset of* $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$.
- *By robust transitivity and* [ABCDW, Theorem 1]*, there exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{T}_p(M)$ of $\mathcal{T}(M)$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{T}_p(M)$ and any $j = 0, \cdots, k$, there exists a hyperbolic periodic orbit of index $i_0 + j$.*

For any $f \in \mathcal{T}(M)$ and any f-ergodic measure μ, we denote by $\lambda^c_i(\mu)$ the Lyapunov exponent of μ along the bundle E^c_i, for any $i = 1, \cdots, k$. As the bundle E^c_i is one dimensional, one has that

$$\lambda^c_i(\mu) = \int \log \| Df|_{E^c_i} \| \, \mathrm{d}\mu.$$

Theorem 1.2. *There exists an open and dense subset $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(M)$ of $\mathcal{T}(M)$, such that for any $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}(M)$, there exist k non-hyperbolic ergodic measures $\mu_1, \cdots, \mu_k$ such that for any $i = 1, \cdots, k$, we have that*

- $\lambda^c_i(\mu_i) = 0$;
- *The support of each μ_i is the whole manifold M;*
- *μ_i is the weak$*$-limit of a sequence of hyperbolic periodic measures of index $i_0 + i$;*

Note that in the case $k = 1$, the existence of non-hyperbolic ergodic measure with full support is also announced in [BBD2], but the proof is quite different.

We denote by $\mathcal{U}(M)$ the set of robustly transitive C^1 diffeomorphisms far from homoclinic tangencies. Hence, $\mathcal{U}(M)$ is an open set of $\mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$.

It is clear, by definition, that $\mathcal{T}(M)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{U}(M)$. Indeed, by Theorem D in [BDPR], the set $\mathcal{T}(M)$ is an open and dense subset of $\mathcal{U}(M)$. As a consequence of Theorem 1.2, one gets the following straightforward result:

Theorem A. *There exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{V}(M)$ of $\mathcal{U}(M)$, such that for any $f \in \mathcal{V}(M)$, there exists a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure as the weak$*$-limit of a sequence of periodic measures, whose support is the whole manifold.*

1.2. **Results in the semi-local setting of robust cycles.** In this paper, we consider diffeomorphisms having a robust cycle. The precise setting is defined in [BBD1] and is called *flip flop configuration*, whose definition uses many other notions defined in Section 2. For this reason, we state our results without too technical definitions.

Consider the open set $\mathcal{RC}$(M) of diffeomorphism f presenting a robust cycle between a transitive hyperbolic set Λ_f of s-index i and hyperbolic periodic point q_f of s-index $i + 1$. [BBD1] built an open and dense subset $\widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$ (that is, the set of diffeomorphisms with a *split flip-flop configuration*) in $\mathcal{RC}(M)$ so that every $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$ admits a point x_f whose ω-limit set $\omega(x_f)$ has the following properties:

- the topological entropy of $\omega(x_f)$ is positive;
- $\omega(x_f)$ is partially hyperbolic with 1-dimensional center bundle;
- every $y \in \omega(x_f)$ has well defined and vanishing center Lyapunov exponent.

This result contrasts with the procedure in [GIKN, KN] which build non-hyperbolic measure as the limit of periodic orbits, in a specific global setting (skew product of a hyperbolic dynamics by diffeomorphisms of the circle). In particular, it is not clear a priori if the (non-hyperbolic) measures supported on the compact set $\omega(x_f)$ built in [BBD1] are accumulated by periodic orbits.

Our first result consists in showing that the controlled at any scale criterion can be used with periodic orbits: the orbits follow this controlled at any scale criterion out of a very small orbit segment, whose weight in the corresponding periodic measure tends to 0; this small orbit segment is used for closing the orbit by using a shadowing lemma in [G].

Theorem B. *With the notations above, for any $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$, there exists a sequence of hyperbolic periodic orbits $\{\gamma_n\}$ homoclinically related to the orbit of q_f, whose center Lyapunov exponent tends to zero, and which converges for the Hausdorff distance to a compact invariant set K_f such that:*

- *$q_f \in K_f$;*
- *the set K_f is partially hyperbolic with 1-dimensional center bundle;*
- *there exists a non-empty compact invariant set $K'_f \subset K_f$ such that any point in K'_f has well defined and vanishing center Lyapunov exponent.*
- *the topological entropy of K'_f is positive: $h_{top} f|_{K'_f} > 0$;*

- *For any $x \in K_f \backslash (K'_f \cup \mathcal{O}_{q_f})$, we have either $\omega(x) \subset K'_f$ and $x \in W^u(\mathcal{O}_{q_f})$ or $\alpha(x) \subset K'_f$ and $x \in W^s(\mathcal{O}_{q_f})$.*

Remark 1.3. (1) *The invariant compact set K'_f built here is indeed the compact set built in* [BBD1] *(see Remark 3.7 in Section 3), that is, the ω-limit set of a point $x \in W^u(q_f)$ whose positive orbit is controlled at any scale.*

(2) *Any ergodic measure supported on K_f is either the Dirac measure on $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$ or a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure.*

(3) *Any limit measure of the periodic measures δ_{γ_n} (supported on γ_n) is supported on K'_f: this follows from the fact that the weight given by δ_{γ_n} to a neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$ tends to* 0.

(4) *As the periodic orbits in Theorem B are all homoclinically related, one gets that, for any limit measure μ of $\{\delta_{\gamma_n}\}$, the whole probability segment $\{t\mu + (1-t)\delta_{\mathcal{O}_{q_f}}, t \in [0,1]\}$ is accumulated by periodic measures, where $\delta_{\mathcal{O}_{q_f}}$ denotes the periodic measure supported on $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$.*

Our second local result consists in showing that the criterion from [GIKN] applies for any $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$, ie. the diffeomorphisms with a split-flip-flop configuration. As a consequence, we get:

Theorem C. *For any $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$, there is a partially hyperbolic set $\tilde{\Lambda}_f$ (with* 1*-dimensional center bundle) and a sequence of periodic orbits $\{\mathcal{O}_n\} \subset \tilde{\Lambda}_f$ such that:*

- *the center Lyapunov exponent of $\mathcal{O}_n$ tends to zero;*
- *the orbits $\mathcal{O}_n$ satisfy the* [GIKN] *criterion. As a consequence, one has that the Dirac measure $\delta_{\mathcal{O}_n}$ converges to a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure whose support is the Hausdorff limit of the orbits $\{\mathcal{O}_n\}$.*

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank Lorenzo Díaz for useful comments.

Jinhua Zhang would like to thank Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne for hospitality and China Scholarship Council (CSC) for financial support (201406010010).

2. Preliminaries

In the whole paper, we assume that M is compact Riemannian manifold.

In this section, we will collect some notations and some results that we need. We start by recalling very classical notions, as hyperbolic basic set and dominated splitting. Then we recall our main (more recent) tools. More precisely, our results consist in applying four tools in a very specific setting. The tools are:

- a criterion by [GIKN] for ensuring that a limit measure of measures supported on periodic orbits is ergodic.
- a shadowing lemma due to S. Liao [L1] and S. Gan in [G] : this will allow us to prove the existence of periodic orbits with a prescribed itinerary.
- a criterion in [BBD1] (called *controlled at any scale*) for controlling averages along an orbit. We will apply it here in the partially hyperbolic setting for getting a vanishing center Lyapunov exponent.

- an abstract dynamical system called *flip flop family* which will be our machinery for producing the orbits on which we can apply the three tools above.

Our setting will be a specific robust cycle defined in [BBD1] and called *flip flop configuration*. The main interest of the flip flop configuration is that they appear open and densely in the setting of robust cycle, and they provide flip flop families.

2.1. **Dominated splitting, partial hyperbolicity and hyperbolicity.** Let us recall that a Df-invariant splitting $T_KM = E \oplus F$ on a compact f-invariant set K is a *dominated splitting*, if there exist $\lambda \in (0,1)$ and a metric $\|\cdot\|$ such that for any $x \in K$, we have

$$\| Df|_{E(x)} \| \, \| Df^{-1}|_{F(f(x))} \|^{-1} < \lambda.$$

We say that a Df-invariant splitting $T_KM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ on a compact f-invariant set K is a *partially hyperbolic splitting*, if E^s and E^u are uniformly contracting and expanding respectively, and the splittings $E^s \oplus (E^c \oplus E^u)$ and $(E^s \oplus E^c) \oplus E^u$ are dominated splittings.

A much stronger splitting is called *hyperbolic splitting*. Recall that a Df-invariant splitting $T_KM = E^s \oplus E^u$ on a compact invariant set K is a *hyperbolic splitting*, if E^s is uniformly contracting and E^u is uniformly expanding under Df, and K is called *hyperbolic set*. A hyperbolic set K is called a *hyperbolic basic set* if K is transitive and there exists an open neighborhood U of K such that K is the *maximal invariant set in* U, that is

$$K = \cap_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} f^i(U).$$

2.2. **Center Lyapunov exponent of ergodic measures supported on a partially hyperbolic set.** Let K be an f invariant compact set admitting a partially hyperbolic splitting of the form $T_KM = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ such that $\dim(E^c) = 1$. We denote by $\dim(E^s) = i$.

For any ergodic measure μ supported on K, the center Lyapunov exponent of μ is defined as:

$$\lambda^c(\mu) = \int \log \| Df|_{E^c} \| \, \mathrm{d}\mu.$$

Let μ be an ergodic measure supported on K. μ is called a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure if we have $\lambda^c(\mu) = 0$, and μ is called a hyperbolic ergodic measure of index i (resp. $i+1$) if we have that $\lambda^c(\mu) > 0$ (resp. $\lambda^c(\mu) < 0$).

2.3. **Homoclinic class.**

Definition 2.1. *Given $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. Let $\mathcal{O}_p$ and $\mathcal{O}_q$ be two hyperbolic periodic orbits of f. We say that $\mathcal{O}_p$ and $\mathcal{O}_q$ are* homoclinically related*, if there exist two transverse intersections $x \in W^s(\mathcal{O}_p) \cap W^u(\mathcal{O}_q)$ and $y \in W^u(\mathcal{O}_p) \cap W^s(\mathcal{O}_q)$.*

We denote by $P(f)$ the set of hyperbolic periodic orbits of the diffeomorphism f. Let $\mathcal{O}_p \in P(f)$, the homoclinic class of $\mathcal{O}_p$ is defined as:

$$H(p,f) := \overline{\{\mathcal{O}_q \in P(f) |\ \mathcal{O}_q \text{ is homoclinically related to } \mathcal{O}_p\}}.$$

Given two hyperbolic periodic orbits $\mathcal{O}_p$ and $\mathcal{O}_q$. Let U be an open neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_p \cup \mathcal{O}_q$. We say that $\mathcal{O}_p$ and $\mathcal{O}_q$ are *homoclinically related inside* U, if there exist

two transverse intersections $x \in W^s(\mathcal{O}_p) \cap W^u(\mathcal{O}_q)$ and $y \in W^u(\mathcal{O}_p) \cap W^s(\mathcal{O}_q)$ such that $\overline{Orb(x)} \cup \overline{Orb(y)} \subset U$.

2.4. **A criterion for ergodicity of the limit measure of periodic measures.** In this subsection, we state a criterion ensuring that a sequence of periodic measures converges to an ergodic measure. This criterion is firstly used in [GIKN, KN] and then developed in [BDG] for building non-hyperbolic ergodic measures as limit of periodic measures whose center Lyapunov exponents tend to 0.

Definition 2.2. *Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and $f : X \mapsto X$ be a continuous map. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $\kappa \in (0, 1)$. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two periodic orbits of f. Then, the periodic orbit γ_1 is said to be (ϵ, κ)* good *for the periodic orbit γ_2 if the followings hold:*

- *there exist a subset $\gamma_{1,\epsilon}$ of γ_1 and a projection $\xi : \gamma_{1,\epsilon} \to \gamma_2$ such that*
$$\mathrm{d}(f^i(y), f^i(\xi(y))) < \epsilon,$$
for every $y \in \gamma_{1,\epsilon}$ and every $j = 0, 1, \ldots, \pi(\gamma_2) - 1$;
- *the proportion of $\gamma_{1,\epsilon}$ in γ_1 is larger that κ. In formula:*
$$\frac{\#\gamma_{1,\epsilon}}{\pi(\gamma_1)} \geq \kappa.$$
- *the cardinal of the preimage $\#\xi^{-1}(x)$ is the same for all $x \in \gamma_2$.*

We can now state the [GIKN] *criterion*:

Lemma 2.3. [BDG, Lemma 2.5] *Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and $f : X \mapsto X$ be a homeomorphism. Let $\{X_n\}$ be a sequence of periodic orbits whose periods tend to infinity. Let μ_n denote the Dirac measure of X_n.*

Assume that the orbit X_{n+1} is (ϵ_n, κ_n) good for X_n, where $\epsilon_n > 0$ and $0 < \kappa_n < 1$ satisfy
$$\sum_n \epsilon_n < \infty \text{ and } \prod_n \kappa_n > 0.$$
Then the sequence $\{\mu_n\}$ converges to an ergodic measure ν whose support is given by
$$supp\, \nu = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\cup_{k=n}^{\infty} X_k}.$$

2.5. **A shadowing lemma.** In this paper we don't construct any periodic orbits by perturbing the dynamics; we just find out these periodic orbits. The way we use to detect these periodic orbits is a shadowing lemma which is firstly given by S. Liao [L1] and is developed by S. Gan[G].

Let Λ be an f-invariant compact set. Assume that there exists a Df-invariant continuous splitting $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$. For any $\lambda < 0$, an orbit segment $\{x, n\} := \{x, \ldots, f^n(x)\}$ contained in Λ is called a λ-*quasi hyperbolic string*, if the followings are satisfied:

- **Uniform contraction of E by Df, from x to $f^n(x)$:**
$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\log\|Df|_{E(f^i(x))}\|\le\lambda,$$
for every $k=1,\cdots,n$;
- **Uniform contraction of F by Df^{-1}, from $f^n(x)$ to x**
$$\frac{1}{n-k}\prod_{i=k}^{n-1}\log m(Df|_{F(f^i(x))})\ge-\lambda,$$
for every $k=0,\cdots,n-1$;
- **Domination of E by F from x to $f^n(x)$**
$$\log\|Df|_{E(f^i(x))}\|-\log m(Df|_{F(f^i(x))})\le 2\lambda,$$
for every $i=0,\cdots,n-1$.

Remark 2.4. *From the definition, we can easily check that a λ-quasi hyperbolic string is also a $\frac{\lambda}{2}$-quasi hyperbolic string.*

Definition 2.5. *Consider $d>0$ and $\lambda<0$. Let $\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of points in Λ and $\{n_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of positive integers. We say that the sequence of orbit segments $\big\{\{x_i,n_i\}\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is* a λ-quasi hyperbolic d-pseudo orbit *if for any i, we have:*

- $\mathrm{d}(f^{n_i}(x_i),x_{i+1})\le d$,
- *the orbit segment $\{x_i,n_i\}$ is a λ-quasi hyperbolic string.*

We say that a λ-quasi hyperbolic d-pseudo orbit $\big\{\{x_i,n_i\}\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is *periodic*, if there exists a positive integer m such that $n_{i+m}=n_i$ and $x_{i+m}=x_i$ for all i. Then, assuming that m is the smallest such positive integer, the sum $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1}n_i$ is *the period* of the pseudo orbit.

Definition 2.6. *Let $\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of points and $\{n_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ be a sequence of strictly positive integers. We define*
$$T_i=\begin{cases}0 & \text{if } i=0\\ n_0+\cdots+n_{i-1} & \text{if } i>0\\ -n_{-i}-\cdots-n_{-1} & \text{if } i<0\end{cases}$$

Let $\epsilon>0$, we say that the orbit of a point x ϵ-shadows *$\big\{\{x_i,n_i\}\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ if for any $i\in\mathbb{Z}$ and $T_i\le j\le T_{i+1}-1$, we have that*
$$\mathrm{d}(f^j(x),f^{j-T_i}(x_i))<\epsilon.$$

Lemma 2.7. [G] [*Shadowing lemma for quasi hyperbolic pseudo orbit*] *Assume that Λ is an f-invariant compact set and there exists an f-invariant continuous splitting $T_\Lambda M=E\oplus F$.*

Then, for any $\lambda<0$, there exist $L>0$ and $d_0>0$ such that for any $d\in(0,d_0]$ and any λ-quasi hyperbolic d-pseudo orbit $\big\{\{x_i,n_i\}\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, there exists a point x whose orbit $L\cdot d$ shadows $\big\{\{x_i,n_i\}\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$.

If moreover the quasi hyperbolic pseudo-orbit $\big\{\{x_i,n_i\}\big\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is periodic, then the point x can be chosen to be periodic with the same period.

2.6. **Plaque family, hyperbolic time and estimate on the size of the invariant manifold.** Let $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$ be a dominated splitting over a compact f-invariant set Λ. We denote by $\dim(E) = i$ and $\dim(M) = n$. Let $\mathbb{D}^i$ be the i-dimensional unit disc and $\mathbb{D}^{n-i}$ be the $(n-i)$-dimensional unit disc. In addition, we denote by $Emb^1(\mathbb{D}^i, M)$ the space of C^1-embedding maps from $\mathbb{D}^i$ to M and $Emb^1(\mathbb{D}^{n-i}, M)$ the space of C^1-embedding maps from $\mathbb{D}^{n-i}$ to M.

Like the situation of hyperbolic set, for a compact set with dominated splitting, there also exist invariant manifolds due to [HPS]. To be precise:

Lemma 2.8. *Under the assumption and notation above, there exist two families of continuous maps*

$$\Phi^{cs} : \Lambda \to Emb^1(\mathbb{D}^i, M) \text{ and } \Phi^{cu} : \Lambda \to Emb^1(\mathbb{D}^{n-i}, M).$$

We denote by $\mathcal{W}^{cs}(x) = \Phi^{cs}(x)(\mathbb{D}^i)$ *and* $\mathcal{W}^{cu}(x) = \Phi^{cu}(x)(\mathbb{D}^{n-i})$*, then the following properties hold:*

- $T_x\mathcal{W}^{cs}(x) = E_x$ *and* $T_x\mathcal{W}^{cu}(x) = F_x$*;*
- *For any* $\delta_1 \in (0,1)$*, there exists* $\delta_2 > 0$ *such that:*

$$f(W^{cs}_{\delta_2}(x)) \subset W^{cs}_{\delta_1}(f(x)) \text{ and } f^{-1}(W^{cu}_{\delta_2}(x)) \subset W^{cu}_{\delta_1}(f^{-1}(x)), \text{ for any } x \in \Lambda.$$

We call $\{W^{cs}(x)\}_{x\in\Lambda}$ *and* $\{W^{cu}(x)\}_{x\in\Lambda}$ *the* plaque families *of the dominated splitting* $E \oplus F$*.*

Definition 2.9. *Let* Λ *be a compact invariant set admitting a dominated splitting* $T_\Lambda M = E \oplus F$*. Given* $\lambda < 0$*. A point* $x \in \Lambda$ *is called a* (λ, E) hyperbolic time *if we have the following:*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \log \| Df|_{E(f^i(x))} \| \le n \cdot \lambda, \text{ for any integer } n \ge 1.$$

Similarly, we can define the $(-\lambda, F)$-hyperbolic time *which is a* (λ, F) *hyperbolic time for* f^{-1}*.*

By Lemma 2.8, we can fix a plaque family W^{cs} corresponding to the bundle E. The following lemma guarantees the existence of stable manifold at the (λ, E) hyperbolic time. The proof is classical (see for instance [ABC, Section8.2]).

Lemma 2.10. *For any* $\lambda < 0$*, there exists* $\eta > 0$ *such that for any* (λ, E) *hyperbolic time* x*, we have that the disc* $W^{cs}_\eta(x)$ *is contained in the stable manifold of* x*.*

Remark 2.11. *Similar result holds for* $(-\lambda, F)$ *hyperbolic time.*

To find the (λ, E) hyperbolic time, we need the following well known result:

Lemma 2.12. [P] *Given a number* A*. Consider a sequence of numbers* $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ *bounded from above by* A*. Assume that there exists a number* $c < A$ *such that* $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \ge n \cdot c$*.*

Then for any number $c' < c$*, there exist* l *integers* $t_1, \cdots, t_l \subset [1, n]$ *satisfying that:*

$$\sum_{i=j}^{t_k} a_i \ge (t_k - j + 1)c', \text{ for any } k = 1, \cdots, l \text{ and any } j = 1, \cdots, t_k.$$

Moreover, we have $\frac{l}{n} \geq \frac{c-c'}{A-c'}$.

Let p be a periodic point and λ be a negative number. Assume that there exists a Df invariant splitting $T_{\mathcal{O}_p}M = E \oplus F$ over the orbit $\mathcal{O}_p$. The point p is called *a* λ *bi-hyperbolic time* if for any $k = 1, \cdots, \pi(p)$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log \| Df|_{E(f^i(p))} \| \leq \lambda$$

and

$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log \| Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{-i}(p))} \| \leq \lambda.$$

The following classical lemma gives the existence of bi-hyperbolic time (see for instance [Wa, Lemma 2.21]).

Lemma 2.13. *Let* $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ *and* p *be a periodic point. Assume that there exists a* Df *invariant splitting* $T_{\mathcal{O}_p}M = E \oplus F$ *and a number* $\lambda < 0$ *satisfying that*

- $$\frac{1}{\pi(p)}\sum_{i=0}^{\pi(p)-1} \log \| Df|_{E(f^i(p))} \| \leq \lambda$$
- $$\frac{1}{\pi(p)}\sum_{i=0}^{\pi(p)-1} \log \| Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{-i}(p))} \| \leq \lambda.$$
- $\log \| Df|_{E(f^i(p))} \| + \log \| Df^{-1}|_{F(f^{i+1}(p))} \| \leq 2 \cdot \lambda$, *for any integer* i.

Then for any $\lambda' \in (\lambda, 0)$, *there exists a point* $q \in \mathcal{O}_p$ *such that* q *is a* λ' *bi-hyperbolic time.*

2.7. **Control of averages at any scale.** In this subsection, we restate a criterion given in [BBD1] of the existence of zero average for a continuous function along an orbit. In this section, let (X, d) be a metric space, $K \subset X$ be a compact subset, $f : X \mapsto X$ be a homeomorphism and $\varphi : K \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function.

Definition 2.14. *Given* $\beta > 0$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$ *and* $T \in \mathbb{N}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$, *we say that a point* $x \in K$ *is* (β, t, T)-controlled, *if* $f^i(x) \in K$ *for* $0 \leq i < T$ *and there exists a subset* $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{N}$ *such that*

- $0 \in \mathcal{P}$ *and* $T = sup(\mathcal{P})$;
- *if* $k < l$ *are two consecutive elements in* $\mathcal{P}$, *then we have*

$$l - k \leq t \text{ and } \frac{1}{l-k}\Big|\sum_{i=0}^{l-k-1} \varphi\big(f^{i+k}(x)\big)\Big| \leq \beta.$$

A point $x \in K$ is *controlled at any scale* if there exist monotone sequences $(t_i)_i$ of natural numbers and $(\beta_i)_i$ of positive numbers, with $t_i \to +\infty$ and $\beta_i \to 0$, such that x is $(\beta_i, t_i, +\infty)$-controlled for every i. Note that this implies that the ω-limit set $\omega(x)$ is contained in K.

Denote by $\varphi_n(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(f^i(x))$, for $x \in \cap_{i=0}^{n-1} f^{-i}(K)$. In particular, if x is controlled at any scale, its positive orbit remains in K so that φ_n is defined and continuous on the closure of this positive orbit. Now, for the points controlled at any scales, we have the following property:

Lemma 2.15. [BBD1, Lemma 2.2] *If $x \in K$ is controlled at any scale, then every point $y \in \omega(x)$ satisfies*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n}\varphi_n(y) = 0.$$

Moreover, the limit is uniform over the ω-limit set $\omega(x)$.

2.8. **Flip flop family and the control at any scale.** Let (X, d) be a compact metric space and $f : X \mapsto X$ be a continuous map. Let K be a compact subset of X and $\varphi : K \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function.

Definition 2.16. ($Flip - flop\, family$) *A* flip-flop family*, associated to the continuous function φ, is a family $\mathfrak{F}$ of compact subsets of K with uniformly bounded diameters that splits as $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}^+ \cup \mathfrak{F}^-$ into two disjoint families satisfying:*

1. *There exists a constant α such that for any $D^+ \in \mathfrak{F}^+$, $D^- \in \mathfrak{F}^-$ and any points $x \in D^+, y \in D^-$, we have $\varphi(x) > \alpha > 0 > -\alpha > \varphi(y)$;*
2. *For any $D \in \mathfrak{F}$, there exist two subsets D_+, D_- of D such that $f(D_+) \in \mathfrak{F}^+$ and $f(D_-) \in \mathfrak{F}^-$;*
3. *There exists a constant $\lambda > 1$ such that if x, y belong to the same element D_0 of $\mathfrak{F}$ and if $f(x)$ and $f(y)$ belong also to the same element D_1 of $\mathfrak{F}$ then*

$$\mathrm{d}(f(x), f(y)) \geq \lambda\, \mathrm{d}(x, y).$$

An important property of flip-flop family is the following:

Lemma 2.17. [BBD1, Theorem 2.1] *For any $D \in \mathfrak{F}$, there exists a point $x \in D$ such that x is controlled at any scale with respect to φ.*

By Definition 2.16, we can iterate any element of $\mathfrak{F}$ and its image contains an element of $\mathfrak{F}$. This leads to the notion $\mathfrak{F}$-*segment* below.

Definition 2.18. *Given $T \in \mathbb{N}$, a* $\mathfrak{F}$-segment *of length T is a sequence $\mathcal{E} = \{E_i\}_{0\leq i\leq T}$ of compact sets such that*

- *$f(E_i) = E_{i+1}$,*
- *there is a family $\{D_i\}_{0\leq i\leq T} \subset \mathfrak{F}$ so that the compact set E_i is contained D_i and $D_T = E_T$*

We call E_0 the entrance of *$\mathcal{E}$ and E_T* the exit of *$\mathcal{E}$.*

Definition 2.19. *Given two $\mathfrak{F}$-segments $\mathcal{E} = \{E_i\}_{0\leq i\leq T}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{0\leq j\leq S}$; if the exit of $\mathcal{E}$ contains the entrance of $\mathcal{F}$, the* concatenation *of $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is a $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E} \star \mathcal{F} = \{G_i\}_{0\leq i\leq T+S}$ defined as follows:*

$$G_i = \begin{cases} f^{i-T}(F_0) & \text{if } i \leq T \\ F_{i-T} & \text{if } i > T \end{cases}$$

Next straightforward lemma gives a precise meaning to the simple idea that, if one controls the averages of φ along $\mathfrak{F}$ segments, one also controls the averages along the concatenation of these segments. This will allow us to build $\mathfrak{F}$-segment of arbitrarily long length on which we control the averages of φ.

Lemma 2.20. *Let $\mathcal{E}_i = \{E_{i,j}\}_{j\in\{0,\cdots,T_i\}}$, $i \in \{0,\cdots,n\}$, be a family of $\mathfrak{F}$-segments of length T_i so that the exit of $\mathcal{E}_i$ contains the entrance of $\mathcal{E}_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{0,\cdots,n-1\}$. Denote by $T = \sum_{i=0}^{n} T_i$ and let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_j\}_{j\in\{0,\dots,T\}}$ be the $\mathfrak{F}$-segment defined as the concatenation*

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{E}_0 \star \mathcal{E}_1 \star \cdots \star \mathcal{E}_n.$$

Assume that there are $\alpha < \beta$ so that for any i and any $x \in E_{i,0}$, one has

$$\frac{1}{T_i}\varphi_{T_i} \in [\alpha,\beta].$$

Then for every $x \in F_0$ one has

$$\frac{1}{T}\varphi_{T} \in [\alpha,\beta].$$

Given $x \in D_0 \in \mathfrak{F}$, a positive integer t, a point $s = (s_0, s_1, \cdots) \in \{+,-\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $T \in \mathbb{N}^+ \cup \{+\infty\}$, we say that x *follows the t-pattern s up to time T*, if for any $n \in [0,T)$ which is a multiple of t, we have that $f^{n+1}(x) \in \cup_{D\in\mathfrak{F}^{s_n}} D$.

Given $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and $s \in \{+,-\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we say that *a $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E} = \{E_i\}_{0\le i\le T}$ follows t-pattern s*, if for any $x \in E_0$, the point x follows t-pattern s up to time T.

The key lemma in [BBD1] to find zero center Lyapunov exponent set is the following:

Lemma 2.21. [BBD1, Lemma 2.12] *Given a flip-flop family $(\mathfrak{F},\varphi)$, we fix two sequences of positive numbers $\{a_k\}$ and $\{b_k\}$ which will converge to zero and satisfy that $b_k > a_k > b_{k+1}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Then there exists a sequence of integers $1 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots$ satisfying that

- *each t_{i+1} is a multiple of t_i, for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- *for every integer $k > 1$, every member $D \in \mathfrak{F}$ and every pattern $s \in \{+,-\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, there exist two integers $T_+, T_- \in \mathbb{N}$ and two $\mathfrak{F}$-segments $\mathcal{E}^+, \mathcal{E}^-$ of lengths T_+ and T_- respectively such that:*
  - *the entrances of $\mathcal{E}^+$ and $\mathcal{E}^-$ are contained in D;*
  - *T_+ and T_- are multiples of t_1 and satisfy $t_{k-1} < T_\pm \le t_k$;*
  - *the segments $\mathcal{E}^+$ and $\mathcal{E}^-$ are (b_i,t_i)-controlled for $i = 1,\cdots,k-1$;*
  - *for all x in the entrance of $\mathcal{E}^+$ and all y in the entrance of $\mathcal{E}^-$, we have*

$$a_k \le \frac{1}{T_+}\varphi_{T_+}(x) \le b_k \text{ and } -b_k \le \frac{1}{T_-}\varphi_{T_-}(y) \le -a_k;$$

  - *the segments $\mathcal{E}^+$ and $\mathcal{E}^-$ follow the t_1-pattern s.*

According to Lemma 2.21, we can find a sequence of orbit segments $\{x_i, T_i\}$ whose lengths tend to infinity in the sense of time and those segments are (b_j,t_j) controlled for any $j < i$. Then the accumulation x of x_i is controlled at any scale and finally any ergodic measure supported on the ω-limit set of x is non-hyperbolic. The last

item in the Lemma 2.21 guarantees that our system has positive topological entropy on $\omega(x)$.

2.9. **Blender.** *Blender* is a powerful tool and shows its power in the study of robust non-hyperbolic phenomena. There have been several versions of blenders, see for instance [BD1],[BD2]. Recently, [BBD1] gives a simplified definition of blender which is also very easy to understand. Here, we will state the new definition of blender and use this new definition.

Before we state the new definition of blender, let's recall some notations in [BBD1]. We denote by $D^i(M)$ the set of C^1 embedded i-dimensional compact discs in compact Riemannian manifold M. We endow $D^i(M)$ with C^1-topology: for any $D \in D^i(M)$, which is the image of the embedding $\psi : \mathbb{D}^i \mapsto M$ where $\mathbb{D}^i$ is the i-dimensional closed unit disc in $\mathbb{R}^i$, the C^1 neighborhood of D is defined as the set of the images of all the embedding maps contained in a C^1 neighborhood of ψ. For any $D_1, D_2 \in D^i(M)$, we define the distance

$$\rho(D_1, D_2) = \mathrm{d}_{Haus}(TD_1, TD_2) + \mathrm{d}_{Haus}(T\partial(D_1), T\partial D_2),$$

where $\mathrm{d}_{Haus}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the Hausdorff distance on the corresponding Grassmann manifold. In [BBD1, Section 3.1], it is shown that the distance $\rho(\cdot,\cdot)$ induces the C^1-topology in $D^i(M)$.

Let $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ be a subset of $D^i(M)$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we denote by $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{D})$ the ϵ open neighborhood of $\mathfrak{D}$ for the distance ρ.

One says that $\mathfrak{D}$ is a *strictly invariant family with strength* $\epsilon > 0$, if for any $D \in \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{D})$, the image $f(D)$ contains an element of $\mathfrak{D}$.

Definition 2.22. (*Dynamical Blender*) *Given $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. A hyperbolic basic set Λ is called a* dynamically defined cu-blender *of uu-index i, if the followings are satisfied:*

- *there is a dominated splitting of the form $T_\Lambda M = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^{uu}$ over Λ; where $\dim(E^s) = Ind(\Lambda)$, $\dim(E^c) > 0$ and $\dim(E^{uu}) = i$.*
- *there exists a neighborhood U of Λ such that $\Lambda = \bigcap_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f^n(U)$ and there exists an f-strictly invariant continuous cone field $\mathcal{C}^{uu}$ of index i defined on $\overline{U}$;*
- *there is a strictly invariant family $\mathfrak{D} \subset D^i(M)$ of discs with strength $\epsilon > 0$ such that every disc contained in $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\mathfrak{D})$ is tangent to $\mathcal{C}^{uu}$ and contained in U.*

The set U is called the domain of Λ, $\mathcal{C}^{uu}$ is called strong unstable cone field of Λ and $\mathfrak{D}$ is called strictly invariant family of discs.

We denote the cu-blender by $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$. We can also define the *cs-blender* which is a *cu-blender* for the reversed dynamics.

Definition 2.23. (*Geometric Blender*) *Let $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. An f-invariant compact set Λ is called a* geometric cu-blender *of uu-index i, if the followings are satisfied:*

- *Λ is uniformly hyperbolic with u-index strictly larger than i;*
- *there exist an open family $\mathfrak{D} \subset D^i(M)$ and a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$ and any $D \in \mathfrak{D}$ we have that $W^s(\Lambda_g) \cap D \neq \emptyset$, where Λ_g is the continuation of Λ.*

The open family $\mathfrak{D}$ is called the superposition region *of Λ.*

The definition of dynamically defined blender is only associated to one diffeomorphism and the geometric blender can tell us the properties of an open set of diffeomorphisms. Actually we have the following result:

Lemma 2.24. [BBD1, Lemma 3.14] *Let $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ be a dynamically defined blender with strictly invariant family of strength ϵ. Then there exists a C^1 neighborhood $\mathcal{U}$ of f such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}$, Λ_g is a geometric blender with superposition region $\mathcal{V}_{\epsilon/2}(\mathfrak{D})$; furthermore $(\Lambda_g, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathcal{V}_{\epsilon/2}(\mathfrak{D}))$ is a dynamically defined blender for g.*

2.10. **Flip-flop configuration.** In this paper, we focus on a co-index one robust cycle, called *flip-flop configuration*, which is formed by a cu-blender and a hyperbolic periodic orbit of different index such that the unstable manifold of the periodic orbit "crosses" the superposition region of the cu-blender, and every disc in the strictly invariant family of the cu-blender could "cross" the stable manifold of the periodic orbit. To be specific:

Definition 2.25. *Let $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ be a dynamically defined cu-blender of uu-index i and q be a hyperbolic periodic point of u-index i. We say that Λ and q form a* flip-flop configuration*, if there exist a disc $\Delta^u \subset W^u(q)$ and a compact submanifold with boundary $\Delta^s \subset W^s(q) \cap U$ such that:*

1. *$\Delta^u \in \mathfrak{D}$ and $f^{-n}(\Delta^u) \cap \overline{U} = \emptyset$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$;*
2. *there exists an integer N such that for any $n > N$, $f^n(\Delta^s) \cap \overline{U} = \emptyset$; Moreover, for any $x \in \Delta^s$, if $f^j(x) \notin \overline{U}$ for some $j > 0$, then $\{f^{j+k}(x)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \cap \overline{U} = \emptyset$;*
3. *for any $y \in \Delta^s$, $T_y W^s(q) \cap \mathcal{C}^{uu} = \{0\}$;*
4. *there exist a compact set $K \subset \Delta^s$ and a number $\delta > 0$ such that for any disc $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, the disc D intersects K in a point whose distance to ∂D is no less than δ.*

A set V is called a *neighborhood of flip-flop configuration* if its interior contains the set

$$\mathcal{O}_q \cup \overline{U} \cup \bigcup_{i\geq 0} f^i(\Delta^s) \cup \bigcup_{i\geq 0} f^{-i}(\Delta^u).$$

It's shown in [BBD1, Proposition 4.2] that the existence of flip-flop configuration is a robust property.

Lemma 2.26. [BBD1, Lemma 4.6]*Let $f \in \mathrm{Diff}^1(M)$. Assume that there exists a blender $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ of uu-index i forming a flip-flop configuration with a hyperbolic periodic point q of u-index i. Let V be a compact neighborhood of the flip-flop configuration.*

If V is chosen small enough, then the maximal invariant set of V has a partially hyperbolic splitting of the form $E^{cs} \oplus E^{uu}$, where $\dim(E^{uu}) = i$. Moreover, there exists a strictly Df-invariant cone field $\mathcal{C}^{uu}_V$ over V which extends the cone field $\mathcal{C}^{uu}$ defined in U, and any vector in $\mathcal{C}^{uu}_V$ is uniformly expanded by Df.

Definition 2.27 (Split flip-flop configuration)**.** *Consider a flip-flop configuration formed by a blender* $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ *of uu-index* i *and a hyperbolic periodic point* q *of u-index* i*. We say that this configuration is* split *if there exists a small compact neighborhood* V *of this configuration such that the maximal invariant set of* V *admits a partially hyperbolic splitting of the form* $E^{ss} \oplus E^c \oplus E^{uu}$*, where* $\dim(E^{ss}) = Ind(\Lambda)$ *and* $\dim(E^{uu}) = i$*.*

The following proposition gives the existence of split flip-flop configuration, whose proof is given in [BBD1, Section 5.2].

Proposition 2.28. [BBD1] *Let* $\mathcal{U}$ *be an open set of diffeomorphisms such that for any* $f \in \mathcal{U}$*, there exist two hyperbolic periodic points* p_f, q_f *of u-index* $i_p > i_q$ *respectively, depending continuously on* f *and in the same chain class* $C(p_f, f)$*. Then there exists an open and dense subset* $\mathcal{V}$ *of* $\mathcal{U}$ *such that for any* $f \in \mathcal{V}$ *and any* $i \in (i_q, i_p]$*, there exists a split flop-flop configuration formed by a dynamically defined cu-blender of uu-index* $i-1$ *and a hyperbolic periodic orbit of u-index* $i-1$*.*

2.11. **Flip flop configuration and flip flop family.** The following proposition shows that the dynamics on a flip-flop configuration induces a flip-flop family.

Proposition 2.29. [BBD1, Proposition 4.9] *Consider a diffeomorphism* f *exhibiting a flip-flop configuration formed by a dynamical blender* Λ *and a hyperbolic periodic orbit* $\mathcal{O}_q$ *. Let* V *be a partially hyperbolic neighborhood of this flip-flop configuration,* $\mathcal{C}^{uu}_V$ *be the associated strong unstable cone field in* V *and* K *be the maximal invariant set of* f *in* V*. Assume that* $\varphi : V \to \mathbb{R}$ *is a continuous function that is positive on* Λ *and is negative on the periodic orbit* $\mathcal{O}_q$*.*

Then there exist an integer $N \geq 1$ *and a flip-flop family* $\mathfrak{F}$ *with respect to the dynamics* f^N *and the function*

$$\varphi_{_N} := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \varphi \circ f^j \text{ defined on } \cap_{j=0}^{N-1} f^{-j}(V).$$

Moreover, given any $\epsilon > 0$*, one can choose the flip-flop family* $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{F}^+ \cup \mathfrak{F}^-$ *such that* $\cup\mathfrak{F}^+$ *(resp.*$\cup\mathfrak{F}^-$*) is contained in the* ϵ*-neighborhood of* Λ *(resp.*$\mathcal{O}_q$*.)*

Remark 2.30. *If* φ *is obtained by extending* $\log \| Df|_{E^c} \|$ *on* K *continuously to* V*, then the points in the* ω*-limit set of an orbit which are controlled at any scale have a vanishing center Lyapunov exponent.*

Remark 2.31. *According to* [BBD1, Section 4.4]*, one can choose the flip-flop family* $(\mathfrak{F}, \varphi_{_N})$ *such that:*

- *the discs in* $\mathfrak{F}$ *are tangent to the strong unstable cone field* $\mathcal{C}^{uu}_V$ *and have uniform diameter;*
- *the disc* $\Delta^u \subset W^u(\mathcal{O}_q)$ *in the definition of flip-flop configuration contains a disc which is an element of* $\mathfrak{F}$*.*
- *Denote by* $W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ *the connected component of* $W^s(\mathcal{O}_q) \cap V$*, which contains* $\mathcal{O}_q$*. For any* $D \in \mathfrak{F}$*, one of the followings is satisfied:*
  - $f^{2N}(D) \in \mathfrak{D}$*;*

– *$f^{2N}(D)$ intersects $W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ transversely;*
– *D intersects $W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ transversely.*

3. Existence of periodic orbits which are controlled at any scale: proof of Theorem B

Let $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ be a dynamically defined blender and $\mathcal{O}_q$ be a hyperbolic periodic orbit. We assume that there are $\Delta^s \subset W^s(\mathcal{O}_q)$ and $\Delta^u \subset W^u(\mathcal{O}_q)$ so that $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathcal{O}_q, \Delta^s, \Delta^u)$ is a split-flip-flop configuration.

Fix a partially hyperbolic neighborhood V of the split flip-flop configuration so that the maximal invariant set $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in the closure $\bar{V}$ admits a partially hyperbolic splitting $T_{\tilde{\Lambda}}M = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ with $\dim(E^c) = 1$.

Thus

$$\log \|Df|_{E^c}\| \colon \tilde{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$$

is a continuous function. We denote by

$$\varphi \colon M \to \mathbb{R}$$

a continuous extension of $\log \|Df|_{E^c}\|$. We denote

$$\|\varphi\|_{C^0} = \max\{|\varphi(x)|, x \in M\}.$$

We denote by $W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ the connected component of $W^s(\mathcal{O}_q) \cap V$ which contains $\mathcal{O}_q$. By Proposition 2.29 and Remark 2.31, there exists a flip-flop family $(\mathfrak{F}, \varphi_N)$ for f^N such that

- the disc $\Delta^u \subset W^u(\mathcal{O}_q)$ contains a disc which is an element of $\mathfrak{F}$.
- for any $D \in \mathfrak{F}$, one of the followings is satisfied:
  - $f^{2N}(D) \in \mathfrak{D}$;
  - $f^{2N}(D)$ intersects $W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ transversely;
  - D intersects $W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ transversely.

Let $\lambda < 0$ denote the center Lyapunov exponent of the orbit of q.

We fix two sequences of positive numbers $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{b_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ which converge to zero and satisfy that $b_k > a_k > b_{k+1}$ and $3b_k < |\lambda|$, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, we require that b_1 is much smaller than the expanding rate of Df along the bundle E^u.

Note that, $\mathfrak{F}$ is also a flip flop family for the function $\frac{1}{N}\varphi_N$. Then for the flip-flop family $(\mathfrak{F}, \frac{1}{N}\varphi_N)$ and two sequences of positive numbers $\{a_k\}$ and $\{b_k\}$, there exists a sequence of integers $1 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < \cdots$ given by Lemma 2.21.

Proposition 3.1. *With the notation above, fix a point $s \in \{+,-\}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, an integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\epsilon > 0$. Then , there exists a hyperbolic periodic orbit $\mathcal{O}_p \subset V$ homoclinically related to $\mathcal{O}_q$, such that*

$$-4b_k < \lambda^c(\mathcal{O}_p) < -a_k.$$

Moreover, there exist $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 < \pi(p)$ such that:

- *the orbit segment $\{p, \tau_1\}$ is contained in the ϵ neighborhood of the negative orbit $Orb^-(\Delta^u, f)$;*
- *$f^{\tau_1}(p)$ follows the t_1-pattern s up to $\tau_2 - \tau_1$;*

- *the point* $f^{\tau_1}(p)$ *is* $(2b_j, t_j, \tau_2 - \tau_1)$ *controlled with respect to* $\frac{1}{N}\varphi_N$ *for* $j = 1, \cdots, k$;
- *the orbit segment* $\{f^{\tau_2}(p), \ldots, f^{\pi(p)}(p)\}$ *is contained in the* ϵ *neighborhood of the positive orbit* $Orb^+(\Delta^s \cup W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q), f)$.

Note that, up to replacing the diffeomorphism f by f^N and the map φ by $\frac{1}{N}\varphi_N$, we just need to prove the proposition for the case $N = 1$.

Proof. Let $\lambda_k = -b_k < 0$. Corresponding to the dominated splitting $T_{\tilde{\Lambda}}M = (E^s \oplus E^c) \oplus E^u$, Lemma 2.7 provides two positive numbers L_k and d_k so that, for any $d \in (0, d_k]$, any λ_k-quasi hyperbolic periodic d-pseudo orbit is $L_k \cdot d$-shadowed by a periodic orbit.

Now the proof of Proposition 3.1 consists in building λ_k-quasi hyperbolic periodic d-pseudo-orbits. For building these pseudo-orbits, we first use the flip-flop family $\mathfrak{F}$ for building arbitrarily large $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E}$ for which φ is (b_j, t_j)-controlled for $j \leq k$. Then we will extend positively and negatively the orbit of a point in $\mathcal{E}$ in order to get arbitrarily close to the periodic point q, so that one gets a closed d-pseudo orbit. By requiring that this pseudo orbit spends enough time (but not too much) close to q, we will get a λ_k-hyperbolic periodic pseudo-orbit shadowed by a periodic orbit with the announced center Lyapunov exponent.

Since the flip flop family $(\mathfrak{F}, \varphi)$ (with assumption $N = 1$) has been chosen so that Δ^u contains an element D^u_0 of $\mathfrak{F}$, by applying Lemma 2.21 to D^u_0, there are an integer T_1 and a $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E}_1$ of length T_1 so that

- $t_{k-1} < T_1 \leq t_k$;
- we denote by D^u_1 the exit of $\mathcal{E}_1$, then the entrance $f^{-T_1}(D^u_1)$ of $\mathcal{E}_1$ is contained in D^u_0,
- any point $y \in f^{-T_1}(D^u_1)$ is (b_j, t_j) controlled for $j \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$;
- any point $y \in f^{-T_1}(D^u_1)$ satisfies the inequality

$$-b_k \leq \frac{1}{T_1}\varphi_{_{T_1}}(y) \leq -a_k.$$

- the $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E}_1$ follows the t_1-pattern s.

We build inductively a sequence $\{T_i\}$ of integers and a sequence $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i\geq 1}$ of $\mathfrak{F}$-segments of length T_i. T_i and $\mathcal{E}_i$ are obtained by applying Lemma 2.21 to the exit D^u_{i-1} of $\mathcal{E}_{i-1}$ and have the following properties:

- $t_{k-1} < T_i \leq t_k$;
- we denote by $D^u_i \in \mathfrak{F}$ the exit of $\mathcal{E}_i$, then the entrance $f^{-T_i}(D^u_i)$ of $\mathcal{E}_i$ is contained in D^u_{i-1},
- any point $y \in f^{-T_i}(D^u_i)$ is (b_j, t_j) controlled for $j \in \{1, \cdots, k-1\}$;
- any point $y \in f^{-T_i}(D^u_i)$ satisfies the inequality

$$-b_k \leq \frac{1}{T_i}\varphi_{_{T_i}}(y) \leq -a_k.$$

- the $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E}_1 \star \cdots \star \mathcal{E}_i$ follows the t_1-pattern s.

Thus $\mathcal{E}_1 \star \cdots \star \mathcal{E}_n$, for $n \to \infty$, is the arbitrarily large $\mathfrak{F}$-segment where φ is controlled. Note that D^u_n is the exit of $\mathcal{E}_2 \star \cdots \star \mathcal{E}_n$. We will now choose a point in

the exit D_n^u whose orbit can be extended positively and negatively in order to get arbitrarily close to q.

Consider a positive number $d < d_k$ such that $L_k \cdot d$ is smaller than ϵ. The number d needs to be chosen very small and its precise value will be fixed at the end of the proof. All the constructions below depend on the choice of d.

According to Remark 2.31 (and the fact that we assume $N = 1$), the exit $f^2(D_n^u)$ intersects $\Delta^s \cup W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q)$ transversely.

Since $\Delta^s \subset W^s(\mathcal{O}_q)$ is compact, there exists an integer $N_d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $f^{N_d-2}(\Delta^s)$ and $f^{N_d-2}(W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_q))$ are contained in $W^s_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q)$.

Hence, there exists a point y_n in D_n^u whose positive orbit remains in V and such that

$$f^{N_d}(y_n) \in W^s_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q)$$

We denote

$$x_n = f^{-(T_1+\cdots+T_n)}(y_n).$$

Thus x_n is a point in the entrance of the $\mathfrak{F}$-segment $\mathcal{E}_1 \star \cdots \star \mathcal{E}_n$, contained in $D_0^u \subset \Delta^u$.

Up to increasing N_d if necessary, we may assume that :

$$f^{-\ell}(\Delta^u) \subset W^s_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q), \text{ for every } \ell \geq N_d.$$

Let us denote by $x_{n,\ell} = f^{-\ell}(x_n)$ and $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ the orbit segment

$$\sigma_{n,\ell} = \{x_{n,\ell}, \cdots, x_n, \cdots, y_n, \cdots, f^{N_d}(y_n)\}.$$

Note that $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ is contained in the maximal invariant set $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in $\bar{V}$. For any $\ell \geq N_d$, one has $\mathrm{d}(x_{n,\ell}, f^{N_d}(y_n)) < d$ so that the orbit segment $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ is a closed d-pseudo orbit whose period is

$$\pi_{n,\ell} = \ell + \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i + N_d.$$

Lemma 3.2. *There are (n, ℓ) so that:*

- $$-3b_k < \frac{1}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1} \varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell})) < -b_k$$
- *$\sigma_{n,\ell}$ is a λ_k-quasi hyperbolic d-pseudo orbit corresponding to the splitting $(E^s \oplus E^c) \oplus E^u$ over $\tilde{\Lambda}$.*

Proof. We will first prove that there exist n and ℓ arbitrarily large such that the first item is satisfied.

For simplicity, we assume that q is a fixed point. By assumption, we have $3b_k < |\lambda|$. We choose d small enough such that for any $z \in B_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q)$, we have that

$$|\varphi(z) - \lambda| < \frac{1}{4} a_k.$$

We denote by $T(n)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}T_i$. For any $\ell\geq N_d$ and any positive integer n, by the choice of $\sigma_{n,\ell}$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))&=\sum_{j=0}^{\ell-N_d-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))+\sum_{j=\ell-N_d}^{\ell-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))\\&\quad+\sum_{j=\ell}^{\ell+T(n)-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))+\sum_{j=\ell+T(n)}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))\\&<(\ell-N_d)(\lambda+\frac{1}{4}a_k)+N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-T(n)a_k+N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\\&=(\ell-N_d)(\lambda+\frac{1}{4}a_k)-T(n)a_k+2N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\Gamma_1=\frac{1}{\pi_{n,\ell}}\big((\ell-N_d)(\lambda+\frac{1}{4}a_k)-T(n)a_k+2N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\big).$$

On the other hand, we have the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))&=\sum_{j=0}^{\ell-N_d-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))+\sum_{j=\ell-N_d}^{\ell-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))\\&\quad+\sum_{j=\ell}^{\ell+T(n)-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))+\sum_{j=\ell+T(n)}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))\\&>(\ell-N_d)(\lambda-\frac{1}{4}a_k)-N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-T(n)b_k-N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\\&=(\ell-N_d)(\lambda-\frac{1}{4}a_k)-T(n)b_k-2N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\Gamma_2=\frac{1}{\pi_{n,\ell}}\big((\ell-N_d)(\lambda-\frac{1}{4}a_k)-T(n)b_k-2N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\big).$$

Hence the average of φ along $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ belongs to an interval of length:

$$\Gamma_1-\Gamma_2=\frac{\ell-N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}}\cdot\frac{a_k}{2}+\frac{T(n)}{\pi_{n,\ell}}(b_k-a_k)+\frac{4N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}}\|\varphi\|_{C^0}.$$

There exists n_0 such that for any $n>n_0$ and any ℓ, we have that

$$\frac{4N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}}\|\varphi\|_{C^0}<\frac{1}{4}a_k$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2 &= \frac{\ell - N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \cdot \frac{a_k}{2} + \frac{T(n)}{\pi_{n,\ell}}(b_k - a_k) + \frac{4N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \| \varphi \|_{C^0} \\ &< \frac{a_k}{2} + b_k - a_k + \frac{4N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \| \varphi \|_{C^0} \\ &< b_k - \frac{1}{4} a_k.\end{aligned}$$

Claim 3.3. *There are arbitrarily large ℓ and n such that:*

$$\Gamma_2 = \frac{\ell - N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}}(\lambda - \frac{1}{4}a_k) - \frac{T(n)}{\pi_{n,\ell}} b_k - \frac{2N_d}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \| \varphi \|_{C^0} \in [-3b_k, -2b_k].$$

Proof. As N_d is constant and $\pi_{n,\ell} = \ell + T(n) + N_d$, one can check that, for any positive number $\delta > 0$, there exist n_1 and ℓ_1 large such that for any $n > n_1$ and $\ell > \ell_1$, we have that

$$\left| \Gamma_2 - \left(\frac{\ell}{\ell + T(n)}(\lambda - \frac{1}{4}a_k) - \frac{T(n)}{\ell + T(n)} b_k \right) \right| < \delta$$

Hence, to prove the claim, we only need to require that

$$\delta - 3b_k < \frac{\ell}{\ell + T(n)}(\lambda - \frac{1}{4}a_k) - \frac{T(n)}{\ell + T(n)} b_k < -\delta - 2b_k,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{b_k + \delta}{-\lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k - 2b_k - \delta} < \frac{\ell}{T(n)} < \frac{2b_k - \delta}{-3b_k + \delta - \lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k}.$$

Remember that $0 < -\lambda - 3b_k < -\lambda - 2b_k$. Thus, when δ is small, we have that

$$\frac{b_k + \delta}{-\lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k - 2b_k - \delta} < \frac{2b_k - \delta}{-3b_k + \delta - \lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k}.$$

Hence, we can choose ℓ and n arbitrarily large such that

$$\frac{b_k + \delta}{-\lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k - 2b_k - \delta} < \frac{\ell}{T(n)} < \frac{2b_k - \delta}{-3b_k + \delta - \lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k}.$$

□

Combining Claim 3.3 with the fact that $\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2 < b_k - \frac{1}{4}a_k$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1} \varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell})) \in (-3b_k, -b_k - \frac{1}{4}a_k) \subset (-3b_k, -b_k). \tag{1}$$

This ends the proof of the first item of Lemma 3.2 and it remains to prove that $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ is a λ_k-hyperbolic string.

By the choice of x_n, we have that $Orb(x_n, f) \subset \tilde{\Lambda}$. Recall that we have the partially hyperbolic splitting $T_{\tilde{\Lambda}}M = E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ and the expanding rate in the bundle E^u is much larger than $-\lambda_k$.

To prove that $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ is a hyperbolic string (for a good choice of n and ℓ), we only need to show that

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell})) < -b_k, \text{ for any } j = 1, \cdots, \pi_{n,\ell}. \tag{2}$$

Since n can be chosen arbitrarily large and t_k is a constant, we can require that

$$\frac{N_d + t_k}{\pi_{n,\ell}} \cdot \| \varphi \|_{C^0} < \frac{1}{4}a_k. \tag{3}$$

Claim 3.4. *For any ℓ large enough and any $j = 1, \cdots, \ell$,*

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^m(x_{n,\ell})) < \lambda + \frac{1}{2}a_k < -b_k \tag{4}$$

Proof. Since for any point $z \in B_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q)$, we have that

$$|\varphi(z) - \lambda| < \frac{1}{4}a_k.$$

Recall that for any $j \geq N_d$, $f^{-j}(x_n) \in B_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q)$. Hence, for any $\ell > N_d$, we have that for any $j \leq \ell - N_d$,

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^m(x_{n,\ell})) < \lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k.$$

For any $\ell - N_d < j \leq \ell$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{j}\sum_{m=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^m(x_{n,\ell})) &< \frac{\ell - N_d}{j}(\lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k) + \frac{1}{j}\sum_{m=\ell-N_d}^{j-1}\varphi(f^m(x_{n,\ell})) \\ &< \frac{\ell - N_d}{\ell}(\lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k) + \frac{N_d}{\ell - N_d}\| \varphi \|_{C^0}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, when ℓ is chosen much larger than N_d, we have that

$$\frac{\ell - N_d}{\ell}(\lambda + \frac{1}{4}a_k) + \frac{N_d}{\ell - N_d}\| \varphi \|_{C^0} < \lambda + \frac{1}{2}a_k.$$

This ends the proof of the Claim 3.4. □

We now choose n and ℓ large enough so that Equations 3 and 4 hold. Assume (arguing by contradiction) that Equation 2 does not hold, then by Claim 3.4, there exists an integer $m_0 \in (\ell, \pi_{n,\ell})$ such that

$$\frac{1}{m_0}\sum_{m=0}^{m_0-1}\varphi(f^m(x_{n,\ell})) \geq -b_k.$$

Then, combining Equation 1 with Equation 3, one gets that

$$m_0 \in (\ell, \ell + T(n)].$$

We denote by $T(i)=\sum_{j=1}^{i}T_j$, for any $i=1,\cdots,n$. Then there exists $1\leq i_0\leq n$ such that

$$\ell+T(i_0-1)<m_0\leq \ell+T(i_0).$$

Remember that $T(i_0)\leq T(i_0-1)+t_k$ and the point x_n is (b_k,t_k)-controlled on the time segment $[T(i_0),T(n)]$, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))&=\sum_{j=0}^{m_0-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))+\sum_{j=m_0}^{\ell+T(i_0)-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))\\&\quad+\sum_{j=\ell+T(i_0)}^{\ell+T(n)}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))+\sum_{j=\ell+T(n)+1}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))\\&>-m_0\cdot b_k-t_k\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-(T(n)-T(i_0))b_k-N_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\\&=-(m_0+T(n)-T(i_0))b_k-(t_k+N_d)\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\\&>-\pi_{n,\ell}\cdot b_k-(t_k+N_d)\|\varphi\|_{C^0}.\end{aligned}$$

Using Equation 3, one gets that

$$\frac{1}{\pi}_{n,\ell}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,\ell}-1}\varphi(f^j(x_{n,\ell}))>-b_k-\frac{1}{4}a_k.$$

which is a contradiction to Equation 1.

Hence $\sigma_{n,\ell}$ is a λ_k-quasi hyperbolic string corresponding to the splitting $(E^s\oplus E^c)\oplus E^u$, ending the proof of Lemma 3.2. □

By Lemma 2.7, we get a periodic point p of period $\pi_{n,\ell}$ such that for any $i=0,\cdots,\pi_{n,\ell}-1$, one has

$$\mathrm{d}(f^i(p),f^i(x_{n,\ell}))<L_k\cdot d.$$

Since $L_k\cdot d<\epsilon$, we have that

- the orbit segment $\{p,\ell-1\}$ is in ϵ neighborhood of $Orb^-(\Delta^u,f)$;
- the orbit segment $\{f^{-N_d}(p),N_d\}$ is in ϵ neighborhood of $Orb^+(\Delta^s,f)$.

When d is small enough, by the uniformly continuous property of φ, we have that

- $-4b_k<\lambda^c(\mathcal{O}_p)<-a_k$;
- p is a $(-a_k,E^s\oplus E^c)$ hyperbolic time in the $(L_k+1)\cdot d$ neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_q$;
- $f^\ell(p)$ follows the t_1-pattern s until the time $T(n)$;
- the point $f^\ell(p)$ is $(2b_j,t_j,\sum_{i=1}^{n}T_i)$ controlled for $j=1,\ldots,k$;

By Lemma 2.10, the point p has uniform size of stable manifold of dimension $\dim(E^s\oplus E^c)$. By the the domination of the splitting $(E^s\oplus E^c)\oplus E^u$ and uniform expansion of E^u, we have that $\mathcal{O}_p$ is homoclinically related to $\mathcal{O}_q$ when d is chosen small.

Let $\tau_1=\ell$ and $\tau_2=\ell+\sum_{i=1}^{n}T_n$. This gives the proof of Proposition 3.1. □

With the help of Proposition 3.1, we now give the proof Theorem B.

Proof of Theorem B. Recall that $\widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$ is the set of diffeomorphisms with a split flip flop configuration.

We take $f \in \widetilde{\mathcal{RC}}(M)$. Fix a point $s \in \{+,-\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ whose orbit is dense in $\{+,-\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ under the left shift. We choose a sequence of positive numbers $\{\epsilon_k\}$ which tends to zero. We apply Proposition 3.1 to (k, ϵ_k), then we have a hyperbolic periodic orbit $\gamma_k = \mathcal{O}_{p_k}$ and two integers $S_k < T_k$ such that:

- γ_k is homoclinically related to the orbit of q_f;
- $\lambda^c(\mathcal{O}_{p_k})$ tends to 0;
- The orbit segment $\{p_k, S_k\}$ is contained in the ϵ_k neighborhood of the set $Orb^-(\Delta^u, f)$;
- $f^{S_k}(p_k)$ follows the t_1-pattern s up to time $T_k - S_k$;
- The point $f^{S_k}(p_k)$ is $(2b_j, t_j, T_k - S_k)$ controlled with respect to $\frac{1}{N}\varphi_N$ for $j = 1, \cdots, k$;
- The orbit segment $\{f^{T_k}(p_k), \cdots, f^{\pi(p_k)}(p_k)\}$ is contained in the ϵ_k neighborhood of the set $Orb^+(\Delta^s \cup W^s_{loc}(\mathcal{O}_{q_f}), f)$.

Up to taking a subsequence of p_k, we can assume that $f^{S_k}(p_k)$ converges to a point x_0. Let

$$K_f = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\cup_{k=n}^{\infty} \gamma_k},$$

then K_f is a compact invariant set and the orbit of q_f is contained in K_f.

We denote by

$$\tilde{K}_f = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\cup_{k=n}^{\infty} \{f^{S_k}(p_k), T_k - S_k\}} \text{ and } K'_f = \cap_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} f^n(\tilde{K}_f),$$

then $\tilde{K}_f$ is a compact set and K'_f is a compact invariant set.

Claim 3.5. $\emptyset \neq K'_f \subsetneq K_f$.

Proof. Consider the accumulation x_0 of the sequence $\{f^{S_n}(p_n)\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, one has that x_0 is contained in the unstable manifold of q_f. Moreover, $Orb^+(x_0, f)$ belongs to $\tilde{K}_f$ and by the compactness of $\tilde{K}_f$, we have $\omega(x_0) \subset \tilde{K}_f$ which implies $\omega(x_0) \subset K'_f$. This proves that K'_f is non-empty.

By proving that $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$ is not contained in K'_f, we show that $K'_f \subsetneq K_f$. The proof is by contradiction. Assume that $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$ is contained in K'_f, then there exist two sequences of positive integers $\{m_i\}$ and $\{n_i\}$ such that

- $\lim_{i\to+\infty} f^{m_i}(p_{n_i}) = q_f$;
- m_i belongs to $[S_{n_i}, T_{n_i}]$.

If we have a subsequence of $\{|m_i - T_{n_i}|\}$ is uniformly bounded from above, then q_f is controlled at any scale associated to $\frac{1}{N}\varphi_N$ for the reversed dynamics f^{-N}; by Lemma 2.15, q_f has zero center Lyapunov exponent, which contradicts to the hyperbolicity of q_f.

If $|T_{n_i} - m_i|$ tends to infinity when i tends to infinity, which implies that q_f is controlled at any scale associated to $\frac{1}{N}\varphi_N$ for f^N. Once again, we get a contradiction. □

Claim 3.6. *Any ergodic measure supported on K'_f has zero center Lyapunov exponent.*

Proof. For any ergodic measure μ supported on K'_f, we choose a recurrent point $x \in K'_f$ in the basin of μ. Arguing as the proof of Claim 3.5, we get that x is controlled at any scale; by Lemma 2.15, we have that μ has zero center Lyapunov exponent. □

By result of Section 2.5 in [BBD1], we have that $h_{top}(f|_{K'_f})$ is positive and any ergodic measure supported on K'_f has zero center Lyapunov exponent.

For any $x \in K_f \backslash (K'_f \cup \mathcal{O}_{q_f})$, there exist two sequences of integers $\{m_i\}$ and $\{n_i\}$ such that

$$\lim_{i \to +\infty} f^{m_i}(p_{n_i}) = x.$$

Up to taking a subsequence of m_i and n_i, we have three possibilities:

(1) For each i, we have that $m_i \leq S_{n_i}$. Then x belongs to the unstable manifold of $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$. The non-negative number $S_{n_i} - m_i$ must be uniformly bounded from above. Otherwise, x belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$ contradicting to our assumption. Hence, there exists an integer N_x^1 such that $f^{N_x^1}(x)$ is an accumulation of $\{f^{S_{n_i}}(p_{n_i})\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, which implies that x is controlled at any scale. According to the proof of Claim 3.5, $\omega(x)$ is a subset of K'_f.

(2) For each i, we have that m_i belongs to $[T_{n_i}, \pi(p_{n_i})]$. Then x belongs to $W^s(\mathcal{O}_q) \backslash \mathcal{O}_{q_f}$. Similarly to case one, there exists a number N_x^2 such that $f^{-N_x^2}(x)$ is accumulation of $\{f^{T_{n_i}+1}(p_{n_i})\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, which implies that x is controlled at any scale for map f^{-1}. Hence, $\alpha(x)$ is a subset of K'_f.

(3) For each i, we have that m_i belongs to $[S_{n_i}, T_{n_i}]$. Then, we have that either $|m_i - S_{n_i}|$ or $|T_{n_i} - m_i|$ is uniformly bounded from above; and we are in the similar situation to case one or case two respectively. Otherwise, according to the definition of K', we would have that $\overline{Orb(x, f)} \subset K'_f$, which contradicts to the choice of x.

This ends the proof of Theorem B. □

Remark 3.7. *In the proof of Theorem B, one can see that the set K'_f contains the ω-limit set of a point x_0 which is controlled at any scale. Actually, One can choose the K'_f to be the ω-limit set of a point in the unstable manifold of q, and which is controlled at any scale.*

Proof. For the accumulation x_0 which is controlled at any scale, by Proposition 3.1, there exists a sequence of $\mathfrak{F}$-segments $\{\mathcal{D}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that

- the length of $\mathcal{D}_i$ tends to infinity;
- the entrance of $\mathcal{D}_i$ is contained in Δ^u;
- the entrance of $\mathcal{D}_i$ tends to the point x_0.

By Remark 2.31, all the discs in the flip-flop family has uniform diameter and are tangent to the strong unstable cone field. As a consequence, one has that for any $i \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a disc D_i in $\mathfrak{F}$ such that the interior of D_i contains $f^i(x_0)$ and D_i is contained in $f^i(\Delta^u)$. Once again, by Remark 2.31, up to finite iterates, each disc D_i intersects the local stable manifold of $\mathcal{O}_q$. Now, one can repeat the argument in Proposition 3.1 by choosing the quasi hyperbolic pseudo orbit such that it spends

large proportion of time following a long forward orbit segment of x_0 and spends the rest of time staying close to the local stable and unstable manifolds of q. Then using the shadowing lemma by [G], we get a periodic orbit with similar property as the quasi hyperbolic pseudo orbit that we chose. As a consequence, up to choosing a subsequence, one gets a sequence of periodic orbits $\{\gamma_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that

- the center Lyapunov exponent of γ_n tends to zero;
- each γ_n spends a large proportion of time to follow a long forward orbit segment of x_0 and spends the rest of time staying close to the local stable and unstable manifolds of q.

One can argue as the proof of Theorem B above, to show that the compact set K'_f is the ω-limit set of x_0.

□

By similar argument, we can have the following result associated to a sequence of hyperbolic periodic orbits homoclinically related to Λ instead of $\mathcal{O}_{q_f}$.

Proposition 3.8. *Assume that $(\Lambda, U, \mathfrak{D}, \mathcal{C}^{uu})$ forms a split-flip-flop configuration with a hyperbolic periodic orbit $\mathcal{O}_q$. Then there exists a sequence of hyperbolic periodic orbits $\{\gamma_n\}$ in a neighborhood of the split flip-flop configuration satisfying:*

- *γ_n is homoclinically related to Λ;*
- *$\lambda^c(\gamma_n)$ tends to 0;*
- *Consider the set $K = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty}\overline{\cup_{k=n}^{\infty}\gamma_k}$, we have that Λ is contained in K and there exists a compact set $K' \subset K$ such that any ergodic measure supported on K' has zero center Lyapunov exponent;*
- *$h_{top}(f|_{K'}) > 0$;*
- *For any $x \in K\backslash(\Lambda \cup K')$, we have that either $\omega(x) \subset K'$ and $x \in W^u(\Lambda)$ or $\alpha(x) \subset K'$ and $x \in W^s(\Lambda)$*

4. Periodic orbits satisfying the [GIKN] criterion in a flip flop configuration: Proof of Theorem C

Let $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ be a dynamically defined blender and $\mathcal{O}_q$ be a hyperbolic periodic orbit. Let ϵ_0 be the strength of the strictly invariant family. We assume that there are $\Delta^s \subset W^s(\mathcal{O}_q)$ and $\Delta^u \subset W^u(\mathcal{O}_q)$ so that $(\Lambda, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D}, \mathcal{O}_q, \Delta^s, \Delta^u)$ is a split-flip-flop configuration.

We fix a partially hyperbolic neighborhood V of the split flip-flop configuration so that the maximal invariant set $\tilde{\Lambda}$ of f in the closure $\bar{V}$ admits a partially hyperbolic splitting $E^s \oplus E^c \oplus E^u$ with $\dim(E^c) = 1$. Let $\varphi\colon M \to \mathbb{R}$ be the continuous extension of the continuous function $\log\|Df|_{E^c}\|\colon \tilde{\Lambda} \to \mathbb{R}$.

Since $\varphi_{|\Lambda} > 0$ and Λ is the maximal invariant set of U, hence there exist a number $\tau > 0$ and an integer N such that for any $x \in \cap_{i=-N}^{N} f^i(U)$, we have that

$$\varphi(x) \geq 2\tau.$$

Lemma 4.1. *With the notation above. There exist two constants $\rho \in (0, \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{C^0}})$ and $\zeta \in (0,1)$, such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any hyperbolic periodic orbit γ which*

is contained inside V and is homoclinically related to $\mathcal{O}_q$ inside V, there exists a hyperbolic periodic orbit γ' which is homoclinically related to γ in V satisfying:

- *γ' is $(\epsilon, 1-\rho\cdot|\lambda^c(\gamma)|)$ good for γ;*
- *$\lambda^c(\gamma') > \zeta\lambda^c(\gamma)$.*

Proof. We denote by λ the center Lyapunov exponent of γ, then there exists a point $y\in\gamma$ such that

$$\frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\log\|Df|_{E^c(f^i(y))}\|\le\lambda, \text{for } k=1,\cdots,\pi(\gamma).$$

Consider the continuous function

$$h_1(t)=\frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+|\lambda-t|}\cdot\frac{\lambda+t}{2}+t$$

and

$$h_2(t)=\frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-\tau}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+|\lambda+t|}\lambda-\frac{3}{2}t,$$

for any $t\ge 0$.

Since $h_1(0)<\frac{1}{4}\lambda$ and $h_2(0)>\frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-\tau}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}\lambda$, there exists t_0 such that for any $t\in[0,t_0]$, we have the following:

$$h_1(t)<\frac{\lambda}{4}\text{ and }h_2(t)>\frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-\tau}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}\lambda.$$

We take a small positive number

$$\delta<\min\{t_0,\frac{1}{100}|\lambda|\}.$$

For the number $\frac{1}{4}\lambda<0$ and the splitting $T_{\tilde\Lambda}M=(E^s\oplus E^c)\oplus E^u$, by Lemma 2.7, there exist two numbers $L>1$ and $d_0>0$ such that for any $d\in(0,d_0]$, any $\frac{1}{4}\lambda$-quasi hyperbolic d-pseudo orbit is $L\cdot d$ shadowed by a real orbit. Now we choose a number $d\in(0,d_0)$ small enough such that

- $(L+1)d<\epsilon$;
- $|\varphi(z)-\varphi(w)|<\delta$ for any two points z,w satisfying $z\in B_{L\cdot d}(w)$.

The precise choice of d would be fixed at the end.

The proof of Lemma 4.1 consists in finding a quasi hyperbolic string which starts at a point on the unstable manifold of y, whose orbit is contained in $\tilde\Lambda$, such that it spends a very long time to follow the periodic orbit γ. Then it spends some proportion of time in the open set U to gain some expansion in the center direction and after that in a small proportion of time it goes into a small neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_q$. Using the fact that γ and $\mathcal{O}_q$ are homoclinically related in V, by the shadowing lemma for hyperbolic set, we can find a hyperbolic string starts from a small neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_q$ to y.

Since γ is homoclinically related to $\mathcal{O}_q$ inside V, by Inclination Lemma, there exists an i-dimensional compact disc $D^u\in W^u(y)\cap V$ and a positive integer n_1 such that

- the backward orbit of $f^{n_1}(D^u)$ is contained in V;
- $f^{n_1}(D^u)$ is C^1 $\epsilon_0/2$-close to Δ^u, which implies that $f^{n_1}(D^u) \in \mathcal{V}_{\epsilon_0}(\mathfrak{D})$.

We denote by $D_0^u = f^{n_1}(D^u)$. By the compactness of D^u and of Δ^s, there exists an integer n_d such that $f^{-n_d}(D_0^u) \subset W^u_{d/2}(y)$ and $f^{n_d}(\Delta^s) \subset W^s_{d/2}(\mathcal{O}_q)$.

By shadowing lemma for hyperbolic set, up to increase n_d, there exists an $\lambda/2$-quasi hyperbolic string $\{w, n_d\}$ from $d/2$-neighborhood of q to $d/2$-neighborhood of y.

By the strictly invariant property of $\mathfrak{D}$, for any integer r, we have that

- $f^r(D_0^u)$ contains a uu-disc $D_r^u \in \mathfrak{D}$;
- $f^{-i}(D_r^u)$ is contained in U for any $i = 0, \cdots, r$.

By the definition of flip-flop configuration, D_r^u intersects Δ^s in a point y_r transversely, for any positive integer r. We denote by $x_r = f^{-r}(y_r)$. By the choice of x_r, one gets that

- the orbit segment $\{x_r, r\}$ is contained in U and x_r belongs to $\tilde{\Lambda}$;
- for any $n > n_d$ such that $n - n_d$ is a multiple of $\pi(\gamma)$, we have that $f^{-n}(x_r) \in W^u_{d/2}(y)$.

For any $r \geq 2N$, where is N is the integer fixed at the beginning of this section, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \varphi(f^i(x_r)) &= \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \varphi(f^i(x_r)) + \sum_{i=N}^{r-N-1} \varphi(f^i(x_r)) + \sum_{i=r-N}^{r-1} \varphi(f^i(x_r)) \\ &> -N\| \varphi \|_{C^0} + (r-2N)\tau - N\| \varphi \|_{C^0} \\ &\geq r \cdot \tau - 4N\| \varphi \|_{C^0}\end{aligned}$$

Denote by $x_{r,n} = f^{-n}(x_r)$ and $\sigma_{n,r}$ the orbit segment

$$\sigma_{n,r} = \{x_{r,n}, \cdots, x_r, \cdots, y_r, \cdots, f^{n_d}(y_r)\}$$

which is contained in $\tilde{\Lambda}$. We denote by $\pi_{n,r} = n + r + n_d$.

Claim 4.2. *There exist two integers n and r arbitrarily large such that*

- $$\frac{n - n_d}{\pi_{n,r} + n_d} > 1 - \frac{2|\lambda|}{3\| \varphi \|_{C^0}};$$
- $$\frac{2\| \varphi \|_{C^0} - \tau}{2\| \varphi \|_{C^0}}\lambda < \frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}} \sum_{i=0}^{\pi_{n,r}-1} \varphi(f^i(x_{r,n})) < \frac{1}{4}\lambda;$$
- *$\sigma_{n,r}$ is a $\frac{1}{4}\lambda$-quasi hyperbolic string corresponding to the splitting $(E^s \oplus E^c) \oplus E^u$.*

Proof. By the choice of $\sigma_{n,r}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\pi_{n,r}-1} \varphi(f^i(x_{r,n})) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-n_d-1} \varphi(f^i(x_{r,n})) + \sum_{i=n-n_d}^{\pi_{n,r}-1} \varphi(f^i(x_{r,n})) \\ &< (n-n_d)(\lambda + \delta) + (r + 2n_d)\| \varphi \|_{C^0}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=0}^{\pi_{n,r}-1}\varphi(f^i(x_{r,n})) &= \sum_{i=0}^{n-n_d-1}\varphi(f^i(x_{r,n}))+\sum_{i=n-n_d}^{n-1}\varphi(f^i(x_{r,n}))\\ &\quad+\sum_{i=n}^{n+r-1}\varphi(f^i(x_{r,n}))+\sum_{i=n+r}^{\pi_{n,r}-1}\varphi(f^i(x_{r,n}))\\ &> (n-n_d)(\lambda-\delta)-n_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\\ &\quad+r\cdot\tau-4N\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-n_d\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\\ &= (n-n_d)(\lambda-\delta)+r\cdot\tau-(2n_d+4N)\|\varphi\|_{C^0}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists N_0 such that for any integer $n > N_0$ and any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}}\Big((n-n_d)(\lambda+\delta)+(r+2n_d)\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\Big) < \frac{n}{n+r}\lambda+\frac{r}{n+r}\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+\delta$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}}\Big((n-n_d)(\lambda-\delta)+r\cdot\tau-(2n_d+4N)\|\varphi\|_{C^0}\Big) > \frac{n}{n+r}\lambda+\frac{r}{n+r}\tau-\delta.$$

There exist n and r arbitrarily large such that

$$\frac{r}{n}\in\Big(\frac{|\lambda+\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}},\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}\Big).$$

Hence, we have the following estimate:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n}{n+r}\lambda+\frac{r}{n+r}\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+\delta &= \frac{1}{1+\frac{r}{n}}\lambda+\frac{\frac{r}{n}}{1+\frac{r}{n}}\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+\delta\\ &< \frac{1}{1+\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}\lambda+\frac{\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}{1+\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+\delta\\ &= \frac{1}{1+\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}\cdot\frac{\lambda+\delta}{2}+\delta\\ &= \frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+|\lambda-\delta|}\cdot\frac{\lambda+\delta}{2}+\delta\\ &= h_1(\delta)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{n}{n+r}\lambda+\frac{r}{n+r}\tau-\delta &= \frac{1}{1+\frac{r}{n}}\lambda+\frac{\frac{r}{n}}{1+\frac{r}{n}}\tau-\delta\\ &> \frac{1}{1+\frac{|\lambda+\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}\lambda+\frac{\frac{|\lambda+\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}{1+\frac{|\lambda+\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}\tau-\delta\\ &= \frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+|\lambda+\delta|}\lambda-\frac{\lambda+\delta}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+|\lambda+\delta|}\tau-\delta\\ &> \frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-\tau}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}+|\lambda+\delta|}\lambda-\frac{3}{2}\delta\\ &= h_2(\delta)\end{aligned}$$

By the choice of δ, we have that

$$\frac{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}-\tau}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}\lambda<\frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}}\sum_{i=0}^{\pi_{n,r}-1}\varphi(f^i(x_{r,n}))<\frac{1}{4}\lambda.$$

This proves the second item of Claim 4.2.

Since we have

$$\frac{r}{n}\in\big(\frac{|\lambda+\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}},\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}\big),$$

where n and r can be chosen arbitrarily large; when n and r are chosen large enough, we have the following

$$\frac{n-n_d}{\pi_{n,r}+n_d}=\frac{1-\frac{n_d}{n}}{1+\frac{r}{n}+\frac{2n_d}{n}}>\frac{1-\frac{n_d}{n}}{1+\frac{|\lambda-\delta|}{2\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}+\frac{2n_d}{n}}>\frac{1}{1+\frac{2|\lambda|}{3\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}}>1-\frac{2|\lambda|}{3\|\varphi\|_{C^0}}.$$

Since $\sigma_{n,r}$ is contained in $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ admits the partially hyperbolic splitting $(E^s\oplus E^c)\oplus E^u$, to prove that $\sigma_{n,r}$ is a $\frac{1}{4}\lambda$-quasi hyperbolic string, we only need to show that for any integer $j\in[1,\pi_{n,r}]$, we have the following

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^k(x_{r,n}))\le\frac{1}{4}\lambda.$$

For any $j\in[1,n+N]$, when n is chosen large enough and d is small enough, we have the following:

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^k(x_{r,n}))\le\frac{1}{2}\lambda<\frac{1}{4}\lambda;$$

For any $j \in [n+N, \pi_{n,r}]$, we have that:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^k(x_{r,n})) &= \frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=0}^{n-n_d-1}\varphi(f^k(x_{r,n})) + \frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=n-n_d}^{j-1}\| \varphi \|_{C^0} \\ &< \frac{n-n_d}{j}(\lambda+\delta) + \frac{j-n+n_d}{j}\| \varphi \|_{C^0}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the last item of the inequality above is increasing when j increases in $j \in [n+N, \pi_{n,r}]$, one has that

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^k(x_{r,n})) \leq \frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}}\big((n-n_d)(\lambda+\delta) + (r+2n_d)\| \varphi \|_{C^0}\big).$$

By the proof of item two, one has that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}}\big((n-n_d)(\lambda+\delta) + (r+2n_d)\| \varphi \|_{C^0}\big) \\ &< \frac{n}{n+r}\lambda + \frac{r}{n+r}\| \varphi \|_{C^0} + \delta \\ &< \frac{1}{4}\lambda.\end{aligned}$$

This ends the proof of Claim 4.2. □

By the choice of the $\lambda/2$-quasi hyperbolic string $\{w, n_d\}$ and the Claim 4.2, we get a $\frac{\lambda}{4}$-quasi hyperbolic periodic d-pseudo orbit $\{\sigma_{n,r}, \{w, n_d\}\}$ of period $\pi_{n,r}+n_d$. By Lemma 2.7, there exists a periodic orbit point p of period $\pi_{n,r}+n_d$ such that

- For any $j \in [0, \pi_{n,r}]$, we have that
$$\mathrm{d}(f^j(p), f^j(x_{r,n})) < L \cdot d;$$
- For any $j \in [\pi_{n,r}+1, \pi_{n,r}+n_d-1]$, we have that
$$\mathrm{d}(f^j(p), f^{j-\pi_{n,r}}(w)) < L \cdot d.$$

Let γ' be the orbit of periodic point p. Since $(L+1)\cdot d < \epsilon$, we have that γ' is $(\epsilon, \frac{n-n_d}{\pi_{n,r}+n_d})$ good for γ.

We take

$$\rho = \frac{2}{3\| \varphi \|_{C^0}} < \frac{1}{\| \varphi \|_{C^0}} \text{ and } \zeta = \frac{2\| \varphi \|_{C^0} - \tau}{2\| \varphi \|_{C^0}} < 1.$$

By the first item of Claim 4.2, we have that γ' is $(\epsilon, 1-\rho\cdot|\lambda|)$ good for γ.

When d is chosen small enough, by the uniform continuity of φ and the third item of Claim 4.2, one gets that

$$\frac{1}{j}\sum_{k=0}^{j-1}\varphi(f^k(p)) \leq \frac{1}{5}\lambda, \text{ for any integer } j \in [0, \pi_{n,r}+n_d-1];$$

by the uniform continuity of φ and the second item of Claim 4.2, one gets that

$$\lambda^c(\gamma') = \frac{1}{\pi_{n,r}+n_d}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,r}+n_d-1}\varphi(f^j(p)) > \zeta\lambda.$$

Hence, p is a $(\frac{\lambda}{5}, E^s\oplus E^c)$ hyperbolic time whose distance to y is less than $(L+1)\cdot d$. By Lemma 2.10, p has uniform size of stable manifold of dimension $\dim(E^s\oplus E^c)$. When d is small enough, combining with the fact that E^u is uniformly expanding, we have that γ' is homoclinically related to γ in V.

This ends the proof of Lemma 4.1.

□

Remark 4.3. *If f is globally partially hyperbolic with center dimension one, we can see from the proof of Lemma 4.1 that we can take V as the whole manifold M.*

Now we can give the proof of Theorem C.

Proof. We fix a sequence of positive numbers $\{\epsilon_i\}$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\sum_{i=0}^{n}\epsilon_i < +\infty.$$

Using Lemma 4.1, we will inductively find a sequence of hyperbolic periodic orbits satisfying the condition of Lemma 2.3.

Let $\rho \in (0, \frac{1}{\|\varphi\|_{C^0}})$ and $\zeta \in (0,1)$ be the two numbers given by Lemma 4.1.

We denote by

$$\gamma_0 = \mathcal{O}_q \text{ and } \kappa_0 = 1-\rho\cdot|\lambda^c(\gamma_0)|.$$

Assume that we already get γ_n. Then we denote by

$$\kappa_n = 1-\rho\cdot|\lambda^c(\gamma_n)|.$$

By applying Lemma 4.1 to γ_n and ϵ_n, we get a hyperbolic periodic orbit γ_{n+1} such that

- γ_{n+1} is homoclinically related to γ_n in V ;
- γ_{n+1} is (ϵ_n, κ_n) good for γ_n;
- $|\lambda^c(\gamma_{n+1})| < \zeta\cdot|\lambda^c(\gamma_n)|$.

For any n, we have that

$$|\lambda^c(\gamma_n)| \le \zeta^n\cdot|\lambda^c(\gamma_0)|.$$

Hence, the center Lyapunov exponent of γ_n exponentially tends to zero when n tends to infinity, which implies

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\prod_{i=0}^{n}\kappa_i \in (0,1].$$

By Lemma 2.3, the sequence $\{\delta_{\gamma_n}\}$ converges to a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure μ whose support is

$$\cap_{n=1}^{\infty}\overline{\cup_{k=n}^{\infty}\gamma_k}.$$

□

5. Existence of non-hyperbolic ergodic measures with full support for robustly transitive diffeomorphisms: Proof of Theorem 1.2

Recall that $\mathcal{T}(M)$ is the set of robustly transitive partially hyperbolic (but non-hyperbolic) diffeomorphisms, whose center can be split into one dimensional subbundles which form dominated splittings. We denote by $d = \dim(M)$ and $i_0 = \dim(E^s)$.

Up to changing a metric (due to [Go]), we can assume that there exists $\lambda_0 < 0$ such that

- $\log \| Df|_{E^s(x)} \| < \lambda_0$ and $\log \| Df^{-1}|_{E^u(x)} \| < \lambda_0$, for any $x \in M$;
- For any $x \in M$, we have that

$$\log \| Df|_{E^s(x)} \| - \log \| Df|_{E^c_1(x)} \| < 2\lambda_0,$$

$$\log \| Df^{-1}|_{E^u(f(x))} \| + \log \| Df|_{E^c_k(x)} \| < 2\lambda_0,$$

and for any $i = 1, \cdots, k-1$,

$$\log \| Df|_{E^c_i(x)} \| - \log \| Df|_{E^c_{i+1}(x)} \| < 2\lambda_0.$$

Let p_f be a f-hyperbolic periodic point. We say that the homoclinic class of p_f is *robustly being the whole manifold*, if there exists a C^1 small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_f$ of f such that for any $g \in \mathcal{U}_f$, we have that

- the continuation p_g of p_f is well defined;
- the homoclinic class of p_g is the whole manifold.

5.1. **Existence of homoclinic classes robustly being the whole manifold.** By [BC], for C^1 generic diffeomorphisms in $\mathcal{T}(M)$ and any $j = 0, \cdots, k$, the set of periodic orbits of index $i_0 + j$ is dense on M and periodic orbits of the same index are homoclinically related; As a consequence, we have that M is a homoclinic class. Recently, [ACS] proves that one can replace the generic assumption by open and dense assumption to show that M is a homoclinic class of periodic orbits of index i_0 and $i_0 + k$ in a robust way. Combining with [BDPR, Theorem E], we have the following:

Proposition 5.1. *There exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{T}_h(M)$ of $\mathcal{T}(M)$ such that for any $f \in \mathcal{T}_h(M)$, there exist $k+1$ hyperbolic periodic points $p_1, \cdots, p_{k+1}$ whose homoclinic classes are robustly being the whole manifold.*

5.2. **Periodic orbits satisfying** [GIKN] **criterion: Proof of Theorem 1.2.** To prove Theorem 1.2, we need the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{T}(M)$ and p be a hyperbolic periodic point of index $i_0 + i$ for some integer $i \in (0, k]$. Assume that the homoclinic class of p is the whole manifold. Assume, in addition, that there exists a cu-blender $(\Lambda^u, U, \mathcal{C}^{uu}, \mathfrak{D})$ of uu-index $d - i_0 - i$ such that $\mathcal{O}_p$ and Λ^u form a split flip-flop configuration.*

Then there exist $\rho > 0$ and $\zeta \in (0,1)$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$ and any hyperbolic periodic orbit p_0 homoclinically related to p satisfying that $\lambda^c_i(p_0) > \lambda_0$, where λ_0 is the number we fixed at the beginning of this section, there exists a hyperbolic periodic point $\mathcal{O}_{p_1}$ such that

- *$\mathcal{O}_{p_1}$ is homoclinically related to $\mathcal{O}_{p_0}$ and is ϵ dense in M;*

- *The orbit of* p_1 *is* $(\epsilon, 1-\rho\cdot|\lambda_i^c(p_0)|)$ *good for* p_0*;*
- $\lambda_i^c(p_1) > \zeta\cdot\lambda_i^c(p_0)$.

Proof. Since Df is uniformly expanding in the bundle $E_i^c|_{\Lambda^u}$, there exist $\tau_1 > \tau_2 > 1$ and an integer N such that for any $x \in \cap_{i=-N}^{N} f^i(U)$, we have that

$$\tau_2 < \| Df|_{E_i^c(x)} \| < \tau_1.$$

For simplicity, we will take $N = 1$.

We denote by λ the Lyapunov exponent of p_0 along E_i^c.

We take $\delta \in (0, \frac{-\lambda}{4})$, whose precise value would be fixed at the end. By the uniform continuity of the functions $\log\| Df|_{E_i^c}\|$ and $\log\| Df|_{E_{i+1}^c}\|$, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for any two points $y, w \in M$ satisfying that $\mathrm{d}(y,w) < \eta$, we have that

$$|\log\| Df|_{E_i^c(y)}\| - \log\| Df|_{E_i^c(w)}\|| < \frac{\delta}{2}$$

and

$$|\log\| Df|_{E_{i+1}^c(y)}\| - \log\| Df|_{E_{i+1}^c(w)}\|| < \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Since $H(p_0, f) = M$, for any $\epsilon \in (0, \eta)$ and any $\kappa \in (0,1)$, there exists a hyperbolic periodic point p' homoclinically related to p_0 (therefore homoclinically related to p) such that

- the orbit of p' is $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ dense in M;
- the orbit of p' is $(\frac{\epsilon}{2}, \kappa)$ good for the orbit of p_0.

Since E_i^c is one dimension, we have that

$$\frac{1}{\pi(p_0)}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi(p_0)-1}\log\| Df|_{E_i^c(f^j(p_0))}\| = \lambda.$$

By assumption that $\lambda \in (\lambda_0, 0)$ and the domination

$$\frac{1}{\pi(p_0)}\cdot\sum_{j=0}^{\pi(p_0)-1}\log\| Df|_{E_i^c(f^j(p_0))}\| - \frac{1}{\pi(p_0)}\cdot\sum_{j=0}^{\pi(p_0)-1}\log\| Df|_{E_{i+1}^c(f^j(p_0))}\| \le 2\cdot\lambda_0,$$

we have that

$$\frac{1}{\pi(p_0)}\sum_{j=0}^{\pi(p_0)-1}\log\| Df|_{E_{i+1}^c(f^j(p_0))}\| > -\lambda_0.$$

Hence, by Lemma 2.13, there exists a $\lambda + \delta/2$ bi-hyperbolic time on the orbit p_0. For notational convenience, we still denote the $\lambda + \delta/2$ bi-hyperbolic time as p_0.

By the uniform continuity of $\log\| Df|_{E_i^c}\|$ and of $\log\| Df|_{E_{i+1}^c}\|$, when ϵ is taken small and κ is close to 1 enough, the orbit of p' has a $\lambda+\delta$ bi-hyperbolic time in the $\frac{\epsilon}{2}$ neighborhood of p_0. For simplicity, we denote the bi-hyperbolic time as p'.

By Lemma 2.7, there exist two numbers L and d_0 corresponding to the number $\frac{\lambda}{4}$ and to the splitting

$$TM = (E^s \oplus E_1^c \oplus \cdots \oplus E_i^c) \oplus (E_{i+1}^c \oplus \cdots \oplus E^u).$$

We take $d < \epsilon/2$ small enough such that $L \cdot d$ is much smaller than $\epsilon/2$. The precise value of d would be fixed at last. By the definition of flip-flop configuration and the homoclinic relation between $\mathcal{O}_{p'}$ and $\mathcal{O}_p$, there exists an integer N_d such that

- $f^{N_d}(W^u_{d/2}(p'))$ contains a uu-disc $D^u_0 \in \mathfrak{D}$;
- For any disc $D \in \mathfrak{D}$, we have that $f^{N_d}(D)$ intersects $W^s_{d/2}(p')$ transversely.

For any positive integer m, we have that $f^m(D^u_0)$ contains a uu-disc $D^u_m \in \mathfrak{D}$. By the choice of N_d, we have that $f^{N_d}(D^u_m)$ intersects $W^s_{d/2}(p')$ in a point x.

Then for any integers n, m and k, we consider the following orbit segment:

$$\sigma_{n,m,k} = \{f^{-n\pi(p')-m-2N_d}(x), \cdots, x, \cdots, f^{k\pi(p')}(x)\}.$$

We denote by

$$x_{n,m} = f^{-n\pi(p')-m-2N_d}(x) \in W^u_{d/2}(p') \text{ and } \pi_{n,m,k} = (n+k)\pi(p') + m + 2N_d.$$

Notice that $\mathrm{d}(x_{n,m}, f^{k\pi(p')}(x)) < d$.

Claim 5.3. *There exist n, m, k which can be chosen arbitrarily large, such that when δ is chosen small enough, we have*

- $$\frac{n\pi(p')}{\pi_{n,m,k}} > 1 - \frac{2|\lambda|}{3\log\tau_1}$$
- $$\frac{1}{\pi_{n,m,k}} \sum_{j=0}^{\pi_{n,m,k}-1} \log \| Df|_{E^c_i(f^j(x_{n,m}))} \| \in \big(\frac{2\log\tau_1 - \log\tau_2}{2\log\tau_1} \cdot \lambda, \frac{\lambda}{4}\big).$$
- *$\sigma_{n,m,k}$ is a $\frac{\lambda}{4}$ quasi hyperbolic string corresponding to the splitting*
$$TM = (E^s \oplus E^c_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E^c_i) \oplus (E^c_{i+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus E^u).$$

The proof of the Claim 5.3 is similar to Claim 4.2 in the proof of Lemma 4.1. The difference is the last item, since the bundle E^c_{i+1} is not uniformly expanding. However, E^c_{i+1} is uniformly expanding when it is restricted to the neighborhood of the blender. Here, we explain a little bit about the uniform contraction of E^c_{i+1} by Df^{-1} from $f^{k\pi(p')}(x)$ to $x_{n,m,k}$. From the proof of Claim 4.2, when we choose δ small enough, for any integer k, we can choose n and m arbitrarily large such that $\frac{k}{n}$ are small enough, the first item and the second item of the claim are satisfied, and $x_{n,m,k}$ is $(\frac{\lambda}{4}, E^c_i)$ hyperbolic time until the point $f^{k\pi(p')}(x)$. To make sure $\sigma_{n,m,k}$ is a $\frac{\lambda}{4}$ quasi hyperbolic string, we only need to show that $f^{k\pi(p')}(x)$ is the $(-\frac{\lambda}{4}, E^c_{i+1})$ hyperbolic time until the point $x_{n,m,k}$. To guarantee this, we only need to ask that k is much larger than $2N_d + \pi(p')$, but still much smaller than n, and we can do that is because we have the following fact:

- $$\lambda_0 < \lambda < 0$$
- $$\tau_2 < \| Df|_{E^c_i(x)} \| < \tau_1, \text{ for any } x \in f(U) \cap U \cap f^{-1}(U).$$

•
$$\log \| Df|_{E^c_i(z)} \| - \log \| Df|_{E^c_{i+1}(z)} \| < 2\lambda_0, \text{ for any } z \in M.$$

We take $\rho = \frac{2}{3\log \tau_1}$ and $\zeta = \frac{2\tau_1 - \log \tau_2}{2\log \tau_1}$.
By Lemma 2.7, there exists a periodic point p_1 such that

$$\mathrm{d}\big(f^j(x_{n,m,k}), f^j(p_1)\big) < L \cdot d < \epsilon/2, \text{ for any } j = 0, \cdots, \pi_{n,m,k} - 1.$$

By the choice of $\sigma_{n,m,k}$ and Claim 5.3, when d is chosen small, we have that

- $\lambda^c_i(p_1) \in (\zeta \cdot \lambda, \frac{\lambda}{4})$;
- the orbit of p_1 is $(\epsilon, 1 - \rho \cdot |\lambda|)$ good for p_0;
- the orbit of p_1 is ϵ dense in M.

Once again when d is chosen small enough, by Lemma 2.10 and the uniform continuity of the functions $\log \| Df|_{E^c_i} \|$ and $\log \| Df|_{E^c_{i+1}} \|$, we have that p_1 has the uniform size of stable and unstable manifolds which implies that p_1 is homoclinically related to p'.

This ends the proof Proposition 5.2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For any $j \in [1, k]$, by Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 2.28, there exists an open and dense subset $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j(M)$ of $\mathcal{T}(M)$, such that for any $f \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j(M)$,

- there exists a split flip-flop configuration formed by a dynamically defined cu-blender Λ^u_j and a hyperbolic periodic orbit p_j of s-index $i_0 + j$;
- there exists a hyperbolic periodic point q_j of s-index $i_0 + j$ whose homoclinic class is robustly being the whole manifold.

By connecting lemma and robust transitivity, we can do arbitrarily C^1 small perturbation to make q_j and p_j be homoclinically related. As a consequence, there exists an open and dense subset $\mathcal{T}_j(M)$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_j(M)$, such that for any $f \in \mathcal{T}_j(M)$, there exists a split flip-flop configuration formed by a dynamically defined cu-blender Λ^u_j and a hyperbolic periodic orbit p_j of index $i_0 + j$; moreover the homoclinic class of p_j is robustly being the whole manifold.

By Lemma 4.1, there always exists a hyperbolic periodic point q'_j homoclinically related to p_j whose Lyapunov exponent along the bundle E^c_j is much larger than λ_0.

Let $\rho > 0$ and $\zeta \in (0, 1)$ be the two constants given by Proposition 5.2. We fix a sequence of positive numbers $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $\sum_n \epsilon_n$ converges.

We will inductively find a sequence of hyperbolic periodic orbits satisfying the condition in Lemma 2.3.

Denote by $\gamma_0 = \mathcal{O}_{q'_j}$. Assume that we already have a periodic orbit γ_n such that

- γ_n is homoclinically related to γ_0 and is ϵ_n dense in M;
- $\lambda^c_j(\gamma_n) > \zeta \cdot \lambda^c_j(\gamma_{n-1})$;
- γ_n is $(\epsilon_n, 1 - \rho|\lambda^c_j(\gamma_{n-1})|)$ good for γ_{n-1}.

By Proposition 5.2, there exists a hyperbolic periodic orbit γ_{n+1} such that

- γ_{n+1} is homoclinically related to γ_0 and ϵ_{n+1} dense in M;
- $\lambda^c_j(\gamma_{n+1}) > \zeta \cdot \lambda^c_j(\gamma_n)$;
- γ_{n+1} is $(\epsilon_n, 1 - \rho|\lambda^c_j(\gamma_n)|)$ good for γ_n.

One can see that $\lambda_j^c(\gamma_n)$ converges to 0 exponentially which implies that the product $\prod_n(1-\rho|\lambda_j^c(\gamma_{n-1})|)$ converges to a positive number. By Lemma 2.3 and continuity of the function $\log\|Df|_{E_j^c}\|$, the Dirac measure δ_{γ_n} converges to a non-hyperbolic ergodic measure ν_j whose support is given by $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty}\overline{\cup_{k=n}^{\infty}\gamma_k}$. Since ϵ_n tends to zero, we have that $supp\,\nu_j = M$.

We take the intersection $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}(M) = \cap_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{T}_j(M)$, which is an open and dense subset of $\mathcal{T}(M)$. This ends the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

References

[ABC] F. Abdenur, Ch. Bonatti and S. Crovisier, *Nonumiform hyperbolicity for C^1 generic diffeomorphisms*. Israel J. Math.183(2011), 1–60.

[ABCDW] F. Abdenur, Ch. Bonatti, S. Crovisier, L. J. Díaz and L. Wen, *Periodic points and homoclinic class*. Ergodic Theory Dynamic System 27 (2007), no.1, 1–22.

[AS] R. Abraham and S. Smale, *Nongenericity of Ω-stablity*. Global Analysis I, Proc. Symp. Pure Math, 1968, AMS 14(1970), 5–8.

[ACS] A.Arbieto, T. Catalan and B. Santiago, *Mixing-like properties for some generic and robust dynamics.* Nonlinearity 28 (2015), no. 11, 4103-4115.

[BBD1] J. Bochi, Ch. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz, *Robust criterion for the existence of nonhyperbolic ergodic measures*. Comm. Math. Phys. 344(2016), no.3, 751–795.

[BBD2] J. Bochi, Ch. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz, *A citerion of zero average and control of the support of ergodic measures*. In preparation.

[BC] Ch. Bonatti and S. Crovisier, *Récurrence et généricité*. Invent. Math. 158 (2004), no.1, 33–104.

[BD1] Ch. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz. *Persistent nonhyperbolic transitive diffeomorphism*. Annals of Mathematics 143, no.2(1996), 357–396.

[BD2] Ch. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz. *Robust heterodimensional cycles and C^1 generic dynamics*. J. Inst. Math. Jussieu 7(2008), no.3, 469–525.

[BD3] Ch. Bonatti and L. J. Díaz. *Abundance of C^1-robust homoclinic tangencies*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 364(2012), no.10, 5111–5148.

[BDPR] Ch. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz, E. Pujals and J. Rocha. *Robustly transitive sets and heterodimensional cycles*. Geometric methods in dynamics. I. Astérisque No. 286 (2003), xix, 187–222.

[BDG] Ch. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz and A. Gorodetski. *Non-hyperbolic ergodic measures with large support*. Nonlinearity 23 (2010), no.3, 687–705.

[BDV] Ch. Bonatti, L. J. Díaz and M. Viana, *Dynamics beyond uniform hyperbolicity. A global geometric and probabilistic perspective*. Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, 102. Mathematical Physics, III. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

[CLR] Y. Cao, S. Luzatto and I. Rios, *Some non-hyperbolic systems with strictly non-zero Lyapunov exponents for all invariant measures:horseshoes with internal tangencies*. Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst. 15(2006), no.1, 61–71.

[CCGWY] C.Cheng, S.Crovisier, S.Gan, X.Wang and D.Yang, *Hyperbolicity versus non-hyperbolic ergodic measures inside homoclinic classes*. arXiv:1507.08253

[DG] L.J. Díaz and A. Gorodetski, *Non-hyperbolic ergodic measures for non-hyperbolic homoclinic classes*. Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 29 (2009), no. 5, 1479–1513.

[G] S. Gan, *A generalized shadowing lemma*. Disc. Cont. Dyn. Syst. 8(2002), no.3, 527–632.

[GIKN] A. Gorodetski, Yu. S. Ilyashenko, V. A. Kleptsyn and M. B. Nalsky. *Nonremovability of zero Lyapunov exponents*. (Russian) Funktsional. Anal.i Prilozhen. 39 (2005), no.1, 27–38; translation in Funct. Anal. Appl.39(2005), no.1, 21–30.

[Go] N. Gourmelon, *Adapted metrics for dominated splittings*. Ergodic Theory Dynamic Systems 27 (2007), no.6, 1839–1849.

[H] S. Hayashi, *Connecting invariant manifolds and the solution of C^1-stability and Ω-stability conjectures for flows*. Annals of Mathematics, 145(1997), 81-137.
[HPS] M. Hirsch, C. Pugh and M. Shub, *Invariant manifolds*. Lecture Notes in Math 583. (1977) Publ. Math. I.H.E.S, 51 (1980), 137–173.
[KN] V. A. Kleptsyn and M. B. Nalsky, *Stability of the existence of nonhyperbolic measures for C^1 diffeomorphisms*. (Russian) Funktsional. Anal.i Prilozhen. 41 (2007), no.4, 30–45; translation in Funct. Anal. Appl.41(2007), no.4, 271–283.
[L1] S. T. Liao, *An existence theorem for periodic orbits*. Acta Sci. Natur. Univ. Pekinensis, 1(1979), 1–20.
[L2] S. T. Liao, *Certain uniformity properties of differential systems and a generalization of an existence theorem for periodic orbits*. Acta Sci. Natur. Univ. Pekinensis, 2(1985), 1–19.
[M] R. Mane, *Contributions to the stability conjecture*. Topology 17 (1978), 383–396.
[O] V. I. Oseledets, *A multiplicative ergodic theorem: Lyapunov characteristic numbers for dynamical systems*. Trans. Moscow. Math. Soc. 19 (1968), 197–231.
[P] V. Pliss, *On a conjecture due to Smale*. Differ. Uravn. 8 (1972), 262–268.
[Sh] M. Shub, *Topological transitive diffeomorphisms on $\mathbb{T}^4$*. Lecture Notes in Math. vol.206, 39, Springer-Verlag, 1971.
[W] P. Walter, *An introduction to ergodic theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics 79, Springer, New York-Berlin, 1982.
[Wa] X. Wang, *Hyperbolicity versus weak periodic orbits inside homoclinic classes.* arXiv:1504.03153.
[WX] L. Wen and Z. Xia, *C^1 connecting lemmas*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 352, 11(2000), 5213–5230.

Christian Bonatti,
Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne
UMR 5584 du CNRS
Université de Bourgogne, 21004 Dijon, FRANCE
E-mail : bonatti@u-bourgogne.fr

Jinhua Zhang,
School of Mathematical Sciences
Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
E-mail :zjh200889@gmail.com
and
Institut de Mathématiques de Bourgogne
UMR 5584 du CNRS
Université de Bourgogne, 21004 Dijon, FRANCE
E-mail : jinhua.zhang@u-bourgogne.fr